

THE CLERGY REVIEW

EDITOR:

THE RIGHT REV. MGR CANON G. D. SMITH, D.D., Ph.D.

ASSISTANT EDITOR:

THE REV. CHARLES DAVIS, S.T.L.

Volume XLV
(NEW SERIES)

January—December 1960

LONDON
THE CLERGY REVIEW
14 HOWICK PLACE,
WESTMINSTER,
LONDON, S.W.1.



The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLV No. 1 JANUARY 1960

ENGLISH SPIRITUAL WRITERS

XIII. ST THOMAS MORE

"FEW characters in English history have drawn to themselves such admiration and even love as Sir Thomas More. Men of all classes, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, respect and venerate him as one of the noblest, if not the noblest, Englishman who ever lived. . . . I have come to the conclusion, in reading through his works, that he paid special attention to the study of dogmatic theology. For when he speaks of grace, free will, merit, faith, charity and other virtues, original sin and even predestination, he is so guarded and exact in his statements that a professional theologian could scarcely speak more accurately." These are the words of Stapleton in the *Tres Thomae* of 1588.

More's modern biographers have elaborated on the theme "the noblest of Englishmen" but very little indeed has been written on St Thomas as a theologian or as a saint. As three-quarters of More's writings are either ascetical or theological treatises, it is obvious that there is still a great gap in our understanding of the genius of More.

That More was a great saint and great contemplative is easily demonstrable. Mr Richard O'Sullivan has pointed out a certain rhythm in the life of St Thomas. It begins in the cell of the London Charterhouse where he was trying his vocation. He married and was then "forced" to Court. Upon his resignation of the Great Seal he returned home for a time and finished his life in a cell in the Tower. In a letter to Meg, written from the Tower, he says "that among all His great benefits heaped upon me so thick, I reckon upon my faith my prisonment, even the very chief". To the same Meg he remarked ". . . if it had not been for my wife and ye that be my children . . . I would not have failed long ere this to have closed myself in as straight a room, and straighter too. But since I come hither without mine own desert, I trust that God of His goodness will discharge me

of my care, and with His gracious help supply my lack among you. . . . Methinketh God maketh me a wanton, and setteth me on his lap and dandleth me". The language here is, surely, the language of a mystic and of a piece with the wonderful phrase in his last letter to Meg "tomorrow long I to go to God". The passage suggests, too, that this is the happiest period of More's life. The agony in the garden, the period of doubt and fear, comes between 1528 and his confinement to the Tower. His imprisonment was, as he says, a special grace, a period in which he gathered the fruits of a life of great holiness. It is clear also that St Thomas was conscious of the Carthusian roots of his spirituality. It is this aspect that we are concerned with here.

Chambers has shown More's great regard for liberty of conscience. The age in which he lived was a dangerous one for talkers and doubly so as the "king's matter" came to a head. In this crisis St Thomas asserted time after time "that he would meddle with no man's conscience and asked only to be left in peace with his own". The unique circumstance of his case only deepened his extreme and habitual reticence. Thomas More is a silent man. For all his mirth and friendliness, few men have been more careful not to wear their heart upon a sleeve. This inner silence is the key to More's character and it is something he learned from the Carthusians. What is here meant by silence is best illustrated by his conduct on the scaffold. Here he had a great opportunity to deliver himself of a most telling *apologia*. Instead he merely said: "I die the King's good servant but God's first." That is, of course, a superb sentence and it deeply impressed all who were there, but it is essentially meant only for Henry. In 1516, when More entered the royal service, Henry had given him this command "that he look first to God and then to the King". More's words in 1535 are his *Nunc Dimittis*.

Again, until he entered the Tower, More was clean-shaven. The beard was an exact measure of his imprisonment. At his trial he had contended that as he was already serving life imprisonment (for refusal to take the Oath of Succession) before ever the Act of Supremacy was passed, he was, as far as that Act was concerned, dead and therefore untriable. Hence the final jest and the last words he ever spoke as "... he bade the executioner stay until he had removed aside his beard, saying:

'That never committed any treason'." His judges of a week before, standing now at the foot of the scaffold, would have understood.

As one would expect, this silence is greatest when it is a question of his relationship with God. None of More's ascetical works were ever intended for publication. The two great works the *History of the Passion* and the *Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation* were written during his imprisonment in the Tower. They were written out of his experience, no doubt, and partly for his enlightenment and because he was a born writer who enjoyed the discipline and effort of composition. They are not formal and present no system of ascetical theology; they tell us practically nothing of any mystical experiences he may have had. What is obvious, of course, is the spirit and deep faith of the writer, but one could not out of these books alone build up a "way of life".

On the other hand, when dealing with More's spirituality the theological writings cannot be ignored. They are not systematic, they are works of controversy. The matter is never allowed to become a question of pure abstract theological argument. More was acutely conscious that the fight was for souls and it is his constant preoccupation to show the practical effects, morally and spiritually, of the new theological ideas. For this reason, one can find passages in the theological work which reveal his burning faith and charity far more than any passages from the ascetical works.

In the preface to the *Confutation against Tyndale*, St Thomas says that he would that people ceased from reading either his or Tyndale's writings but read "English books as most may nourish and increase devotion, of which be Bonaventure's *Life of Christ*, Gerson on the *Following of Christ* and the devout contemplative book *Scala Perfectionis*". The last is obviously the most important in More's own life. Chambers has shown how rooted in the writings of the early English mystics is the prose of More. So too is his spirituality, and it is with Hilton, "the most theological of these writings", that St Thomas has most affinity. Here, again, the Carthusian influence is at work for three of the surviving MSS. of Hilton are Carthusian copies c. 1500-10 and two of these come from the London Charterhouse.

If we had nothing but More's works upon which to base our opinions, we could do little more than guess that Hilton was his mentor. And although he spent long hours in the chapel at Chelsea, usually behind locked doors, scarcely any prayer written by him would have been found. But the letters he sent to Meg from the Tower, and the two collections of prayers: *A Godly Meditation* (written in 1534) and *A Devout Prayer* (made during the last week of his life) were preserved by the family. The prayers were written and sent to Margaret that father and daughter might pray together for what little time remained to him. They incorporate, here and there, prayers of Margaret, but they are really both a priceless relic of a life of prayer and his last instructions to his most beloved disciple. The whole would cover a mere thirty pages of print and it seems a crime to select from such a source. But it must be done, for the only way to understand More's spirituality is to start from the prayers and to use his ascetical and theological works as a commentary, as it were, upon them.

Give me thy grace, good Lord.
To set the world at nought,
To set my mind fast upon thee.

.

To be content to be solitary,

.

Gladly to be thinking of God,
Piteously to call for his help,
To lean unto the comfort of God,
Busily labour to love him.

.

To bear the cross with Christ,

.

To have continually in mind the passion that Christ
suffered for me,
For his benefits uncessantly to give him thanks.

.

Of worldly substance, friends, liberty, life and all, to
set the loss at right nought, for the winning of Christ.

.

Almighty God, *Doce me facere voluntatem tuam. Fac me
currere in odore unguentorum tuorum. Apprehende manum dex-
teram, et deduc me in via recta propter inimicos meos. Trahe
me post te. In chamo et freno maxillas meas constringe, quum
non approximo ad te.*

Good Lord, give me the grace, in all my fear and agony, to
have recourse to that great fear and wonderful agony that thou,
my sweet Saviour, hadst at the Mount of Olivet before thy most
bitter passion, and in the meditation thereof, to conceive ghostly
comfort and consolation profitable for my soul.

Give me, good Lord, a full faith, a firm hope, and a fervent
charity, a love to thee good Lord incomparable above the love
to myself; and that I love nothing to thy displeasure, but
everything in an order to thee.

Take from me, good Lord, this lukewarm fashion, or rather
key-cold manner of meditation, and this dullness in praying
unto thee. And give me warmth, delight and quickness in think-
ing upon thee. And give me thy grace to long for thine holy
sacraments, and especially to rejoice in the presence of thy very
blessed body, sweet Saviour Christ, in the holy sacrament of the
altar, and duly to thank thee for thy gracious visitation there-
with, and at that high memorial, with tender compassion, to
remember and consider thy most bitter passion.

Make us all, good Lord, virtually participant of that holy
sacrament this day, and everyday make us all lively members,
sweet Saviour Christ, of thine holy mystical body, thy Catholic
Church.

Lord, give me patience in tribulation and grace in everything
to conform my will to thine: that I may truly say: *Fiat voluntas
tua, sicut in coelo et in terra.*

The things, good Lord, that I pray for, give me thy grace
to labour for. Amen.

One is struck first, by the depth of faith, tenderness of devotion and the beauty of language of these prayers. But they are couched, too, in the careful language of a lawyer and a theologian. Luther had appeared, and these devotions are, therefore, firmly set against a background of faith and works, and the gratuity of faith has been emphasized.

In the fourth book of *Dialogues against Tyndale*, More deals with the question of faith and works. The question has been dealt with, he says, in the time of the Pelagian heresy, and Luther, by his doctrine, is an even worse opponent of grace than Pelagius. All our sufficiency is from God. He does not need either our faith or our works, but He has appointed that these are the conditions of our salvation. One quotation must suffice to show both More's theological exactness and his burning faith.

Nor that all the laws of Moses, nor all the good works of man, were not able to save one man of themselves, nor without faith and that Christ freely redeemed us. For neither had he or ever shall have any reward of us, for the bitter pains taken in his blessed passion for us. Nor never deserved we unto him that he should so much do for us. Nor the first faith, nor the preaching thereof nor the first justification of man thereby, nor the sacrament and fruit of our baptism, was not given to the world for any good works that ever the world had wrought; but only for God's mere liberal goodness.

The remarkable theological accuracy of the prayers is the first point to be noted. The second is the obvious influence of Hilton. In the space available this latter fact cannot be adequately demonstrated, but here are some indications: "A man shall not come to ghostly light in contemplation of Christ's Godhead, unless he is come in imagination by bitterness, and by compassion and by steadfast thinking on his manhood", says the Ladder. "Imagination by bitterness", "compassion", "steadfast thinking"; all these phrases are apt descriptions of the spirit of More's *History of the Passion* and of his prayers to our Blessed Lord in His agony—"with tender compassion, to remember and consider Thy most bitter passion".

Nowhere is Hilton's influence stronger than in the prayer which is the key to More's spirituality.

Give me, good Lord, a full faith, firm hope and fervent charity, a love to thee, good Lord, incomparable above the love to myself; and that I love nothing to thy displeasure, but everything in an order to thee.

"Full faith" is Hilton's "Feeling faith". "Feeling faith" had assumed, by 1535, Lutheran overtones and could not now be used with safety. In the early days of conversion, says Hilton, a man who wishes to serve God will need to rely on his "natural wit"; he will need to study and to read and there will be little conscious devotion in his prayers. Soon, if he is faithful in his work and prayer he will be led to some "ghostly contemplation". Under the influence of the Holy Spirit his faith will deepen: he will *realize* more deeply the implications of the dogmas of faith. There are stages in this development; at one time the affections are used more than the understanding, but ultimate perfection in contemplation is both "in cognition and understanding". This "way" to perfection is implicit in More's prayers; it is obvious in the adaptations of St Paul's phrases and in prayer which asks for a "taste of thy holy Spirit". Hilton had been careful to point out, of course, that the higher gifts of contemplation are seldom continuous, for this is not a doctrine of disguised quietism, and there will always be need of formal prayer and meditation. In More's words one must "Busily labour to love thee". Hence, too, the hair shirt, returned to Meg only on the last day of his life. This conscious belief in the process by which the soul is gradually "opened" to the influence of grace is evident everywhere in the writings of St Thomas. On persecution, for instance, he can write:

This manner of ours, in whose breast the great good counsel of God no better settleth nor taketh no better roots may well declare us that the thorns and briers and the brambles of our worldly substance grow so thick, and spring so high in the ground of our hearts, that they strangle, as the Gospel saith, the word of God that was sown therein. And therefore is God a very good Lord unto us, when he causeth like a good husbandman his folk

to come afield (for the persecutors be his folk for this purpose) and with their hooks and stocking-irons grub up those wicked weeds and bushes of our earthly substance, and carry them right away from us, that the word of God sown in our hearts may have room therein, *and a glade round about for the warm sun of grace to come and make it grow.*

Such a deep realization of God's providence and the power of grace demands an equally deep appreciation of Man's weakness and the limited nature of his understanding. Luther had gone so far in stressing the effects of original sin, that, as More says, he makes as if "all our works were brought forth out of us without our will . . . out of a brute beast by appetite of sensual motion". More can put the situation quite simply:

One tribulation is it to good men, to feel in themselves the conflict of the flesh against the soul, the rebellion of sensuality against the rule and government of reason, the relic that remains in mankind of old original sin of which St Paul so sore complaineth in his epistle to the Romans. And yet we may not pray to have this kind of tribulation taken from us. For it is left us by God's ordinance to strive against it and by *reason and grace* to master it, and use it for the matter of our merit.

So much for "full faith" to which "firm hope" is but the natural corollary. Such hope is obvious in these prayers. As an example of humility and hope what better example could there be than the answer he gave to Cromwell? "... I have not been a man of such holy living, as I might be bold to offer myself to death, lest God for my presumption might suffer me to fall; and therefore I put not myself forward but draw back. Howbeit, if God draw me to himself, then I trust in his great mercy, that He shall not fail to give me grace and strength."

Now the second half of the important prayer quoted above: "that I love nothing to thy displeasure but everything in an order to thee" is magnificent in its simplicity. Here is a statement of the "way of acceptance"; an affirmation of the goodness of God's creation, the way to perfection of the layman who needs must live in the world. Of this "way" Hilton had written in *The Mixed Life*, but by his example and in his writings

St Thomas goes beyond anything Hilton had written. This aspect of More's teaching is so important that it needs special treatment. His adaptation of "Poverty", "Chastity" and "Obedience" to the lay state is especially interesting and here he is well in advance of his age. One example may be given; it is rather complicated and involved, but he is feeling his way to an idea that he is half frightened to suggest.

If there be a man such (as would God there were many) that hath unto riches no love, but having them fall abundantly upon him, taketh to his own part no great pleasure thereof, but, as though he had it not, keepeth himself in like abstinence and pennance privily as he would do in case he had it not, and in such things as he doth openly bestow somewhat more liberally upon himself in his house after some manner of the world, lest he should give other folk occasion to marvel and muse and talk of his manner, and misreport him for an hypocrite, therein between God and him doth truly protest and testify, as did the good queen Hester, that he doth it not for any desire thereof in the satisfying of his own pleasure, but would with as good a will or better, forbear the possession of riches, saving for the commodity that other men have by its disposing thereof, as percase in keeping a good household in good Christian order and fashion, and in setting other folk a work with such things as they gain their living the better by his means, this man's riches I might (Methinketh) in merit match in a manner with another man's forsaking of all, if there were none other circumstance more pleasant unto God farther added unto the forsaking beside, as percase for the more fervent contemplation by reason of the solicitude of all worldly business left off, which was the thing that made Mary Magdalene's part the better.

The sentence is indeed involved, but the idea is fairly clear. Hilton had said that to neglect business, wife and children in order to contemplate was like dressing the head of Christ with a lovely diadem whilst leaving the body all in rags. More takes the matter further and tries to work the principle out in detail. It is also interesting in that it clearly shows why St Thomas looked upon his imprisonment as the greatest blessing given him by God. At last he had "time and opportunity" for prayer. In earlier years he had had to steal from sleep the time to pray

and write his theology. After serving with Martha he now had a few months to contemplate with Mary Magdalene.

Finally, notice the prayers to the Blessed Sacrament given above, ending with the prayer that we may all "be lively members, sweet saviour Christ, of thine Holy mystical Body, thy catholic Church". Again, there is evident here the same theological exactness; for the words "virtually participant" are, surely, a reference to the teaching of Aquinas on the Eucharist as the source of grace. The important feature, however, is that whereas the earlier mystical writers, and even Hilton, had *assumed* the sacramental life, More finds it necessary, because of the advent of Luther, to integrate his great devotion to the person of our Blessed Lord, with the Mass, in a more conscious manner; but beyond that, there is a deep awareness of the mystical Body, an awareness somewhat rare in the sixteenth century. This aspect of More's writings needs an article on its own. Chambers has shown how strong was More's "mediaeval sense of unity". It is more than that. Few men have had a deeper realization of the dogma of the mystical Body, and his passionate defence of European unity is not the oratory of a statesman but the cry of a saint. It is this that makes him such a "saint for today".

There is so much more that could be said. Scarcely anything has been said on penance. No reference has been made to a Kempis or to St Augustine, and both of these exerted great influence on More's spirituality. Since so many societies and groups, of lawyers, civil servants, local government officials, politicians, writers, students and many others have taken him as their patron, more attention should be paid to him as a teacher of a "lay spirituality". He is intensely English and directly in the line of the English mystics. Faced with the challenge of Luther, he recast, as it were, the essence of their teaching, in a safe and modern framework of theology. How refreshing, too, to be bidden, as were his children, "to serve God, and be merry and rejoice in him"!

BERNARD FISHER

THOMAS CARDINAL WOLSEY:
REFLEXIONS ON TWO RECENT BOOKS

ONE of the greatest of English statesmen, and probably the most loathed and hated of the Church's prelates throughout history, Wolsey is sure never to lack biographers. The best modern account of him for thirty years was indubitably Professor Pollard's *Wolsey*, published by Longmans in 1929, more than twenty-five years after his equally successful *Henry VIII*. In spite of a slightly perceptible Anglican bias at times, these books are not unfair; and they are extremely readable. They might still be the standard books, if they were available in bookshops. Belloc's *Wolsey*, which appeared in 1933, has little to recommend it, apart from its author's name; as history, it is grossly inaccurate and paradoxical, and it has not the redeeming beauty of style or power of characterization to justify keeping it on our shelves: "It is supremely bad, Belloc himself said. I say so with full knowledge of how bad writing can be . . ." (Speaight, *Life of H. Belloc*, p. 423).

With Belloc unreliable, and Pollard unavailable, no wonder that the public favour should have gone to the new *Life* of the Cardinal published by Longmans in 1958, under the Shakespearean title: *Naked to mine enemies*. The author is an American journalist working on the staff of the *Reader's Digest*. Reviewers have giggled over the fact that a précis specialist was giving us 534 pages of close text; and literary purists have found much lousing to do in his mixture of Yankee journalese and quaint Tudor phraseology. Yet the book, despite its bulk and its price and its American authorship, is likely to remain a good seller in Britain for a number of years.

Charles Ferguson has not bungled his task; it has cost him thirty years' research, he tells us, although he has contented himself with the documents available in print. His main source has been, of course, the huge compilation by Brewer known as *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*. He is wrong, however, in imagining that this invaluable and indispensable documentation is both complete and infallible. Many "papers" are not given in full, but summarized: in which

case the précis, owing to hurried or biased perusal, or to inadequate knowledge of the original language, is not seldom misleading. Wrong dating, on the other hand, often alters the significance of the evidence afforded. And finally, a good deal of essential material has been made available since Brewer's days; and much ground remains to be dug by students of today or tomorrow.

Enough is known, nevertheless, about the protagonists for their biographers to feel sure that they can tell their stories and portray their features, even though they are still unable to explore the depths of their souls. And Wolsey's biographers will turn immediately to a book written a quarter of a century after the Cardinal's death, by his gentleman-usher George Cavendish, not printed till 1641, and now for the first time produced in a critical edition for the Early English Text Society. This is *The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey* (Oxford University Press, 1959, lii + 304 pp.), edited by an American scholar, Richard S. Sylvester, Professor at Yale University, from the autograph manuscript in the British Museum. The book has come too late for Ferguson to have been able to avail himself, not only of its reliable text, but of its lengthy introduction, learned annotations and appendices. But, to anyone interested in Wolsey, it is still rewarding, and indeed most refreshing, after reading a modern *Life*, to gaze at the hero through the loving eyes of his old servant.

For there is affection as well as admiration in the pages of Cavendish; his keen observant look was never cruel; his young heart was readier to wonder than to scorn; and the extreme charm of his little book is less due, perhaps, to his literary skill than to the long rumination and maturation of his memories during twenty-five years or more. Cavendish attended on the Cardinal in the height of his glory, especially in his triumphant procession to Amiens during the summer of 1527; and he "remained with him after his fall continually during the term of all his trouble until he died" (p. 4 in Sylvester's edition, with spelling modernized). The Cardinal had besought his domestics to serve no man after him below the dignity of a king; Cavendish thought even the King an unsuitable master, and retired to his lands.

He writes as a Catholic, in the reign of Queen Mary, while Nicholas Harpsfield is writing his *Life of Thomas More*. His professed aim is to counteract the Protestant bias of men like Hall the chronicler, in whose eyes the scarlet of the Legate's robes was the livery of hell itself. Yet the book, although it is a vindication, is never exasperatingly apologetic or eulogistic. It is the honest report of an eye-witness. Time, naturally, has blurred many a recollection; there is a grain of epic exaggeration in the anecdotes told by Wolsey himself about his first years at court; allowance must be made also for an element of hero-worship, and the ageing man's inevitable *laudatio temporis acti*. From a distance the days of cloth of gold looked like a golden age. Everything was young and full of hope when he himself was a young man with a future. "Thus much I dare be bold to say," he writes nostalgically, "that in my judgement I never saw this realm in better order, quietness and obedience than it was in the time of his authority and rule, ne justice better ministered with indifferency" (p. 4). The book is also a meditation on the "chances of fortune. Fortune smiled so upon him: but to what end she brought him, ye shall hear after. Therefore let all men to whom fortune extendeth her grace not to trust too much to her fickle favour and pleasant promises, under colour whereof she carrieth venomous gall . . ." (p. 13).

Even more than Wolsey's iron hand and impartial justice, Cavendish seems to miss the pomp and pageantry, the noise and fury of his "reign". He uses the word "sumptuous" with much the same relish as the nine-year-old Daisy Ashford of *The Young Viseters*. But what he tells us of his master's "speedy expediency . . . almost beyond the capacity of man", and of his unheard-of splendour, reads as often as not like a terrible indictment. That in Compiègne the Cardinal, rising at four o'clock a.m., should sit in his nightcap and shirt writing to England until four o'clock p.m., and "never rise once to piss ne yet to take any meat", is admittedly a feat of energy and efficiency, worthy of Chairman Khrushchev's endurance records; but when we think that his chaplain was standing at the altar every minute of those twelve hours, ready to begin mass as soon as his Grace was ready for it, and that his Grace was completely unmindful of his chaplain, we would rather change this strenuous and capable negotiator

for a less inhuman master. His flamboyant processions, with the two mules liturgically vested each in two layers of crimson velvet and cloth of gold, "the best that could be got for money or friendship", cannot make us forget the crowds gaping at them in their rags, and the hundreds who were hanged for stealing some of the corn levied from every farm, even in seasons of dearth, to be squandered on foreign wars.

And yet the gentleman-usher does not seem to experience any of the anger which the modern reader feels rising in his heart. Somehow Wolsey managed to win the indulgence of those who knew him at close quarters: there must have been something attaching about him in his more relaxed moments. "He never went to his bed with any part of his divine service unsaid, yea not so much as one collect." This must have struck the gentlemen around him as strange in such a worldly prelate and deceitful diplomat. Ferguson comments, page 359: "The office which he said daily, and the obeisance which he made to religion at least served to remind and accuse his soul." Other influences may have prevented the milk of human kindness and the religious sense from drying up in his soul altogether: his intercourse with quiet, thoughtful and pious people such as Fisher, More, Tunstal, Campeggio, Queen Catherine; events like the sack of Rome, in which Pope and Curia paid the horrible penalty of their worldliness; and also the triple visitation of the sweating sickness which endangered his life in 1517 and 1518. We have a letter from him to Henry VIII in 1523 asking a reward for Thomas More "because he is not the most ready to speak and solicit his own cause" (State Papers, I, 124). This shows Wolsey at his best. More's way, detached, peaceful and loving-kind, must have set him dreaming; but he had little time for musing, and his mind was soon caught again in the maelstrom of his manifold business.

Nothing less than a fall from the King's favour was needed to awaken the Cardinal from his own day-dreams. And even that was not quite enough: for the eyes unsealed by disgrace were those of a man weary and prematurely aged by overwork: they blinked uneasily at the clear light of day. The victim of Henry's greed and Anne's jealousy might borrow a hairshirt from the Carthusians and wear it beneath another shirt of fine

Holland silk: he was not yet weary of power and the trappings of power. His sorrow was remorse rather than healing contrition. His "deep sighs" and "woeful lamentations", just like his "frowning cheer" and rough handling of better days, were weapons he used to wrest favours from his gaolers and servants: with the same histrionic skill as ever, and still considerable success. Cavendish, page 165, gives us a specimen of his talk during that bleak November 1530, while he was being led southwards by the Constable of the Tower, and led also to his grave by a relentless flux: "He is my staff that supporteth me, and the wall that defendeth me . . . having none other refuge to flee to for defence but under the shadow of his majesty's wing." This comes straight from the Psalter which his Grace had recited every day, joining the chorus of thousands of his fellow-priests; only, the God to whom he is turning now is not the Lord of Heaven, but the Lord of England, the grown-up lion whom he, Wolsey, has too well taught his strength, the almighty Henry who has given his minister over in his grey hairs.

No word describes the Chancellor-cum-Legate more aptly than "minister". He ministered to his master's whims as to his will. And he did it because all promotion was in the King's gift. Cavendish makes this clear from the start: "He was most earnest and readiest among all the Council to advance the king's only will and pleasure without any respect to the case. The king therefore perceived him to be a meet *instrument* (my italics) for the accomplishment of his devised will and pleasure. . . . All his endeavour was only to satisfy the king's mind, knowing right well that it was the very vein and right course to bring him to high promotion. . . . Nothing scrupulous in any thing that the king would command him to do" (pp. 11-14). These words, though they are not meant to be harsh, lay bare the root of all the mischief; they confirm the judgement passed anonymously by the uncle of Cavendish, St Thomas More, in the tenth chapter of the third book of his *Dialogue of Comfort*, under the title "of flattery": "Glorious was he very far above all measure; and that was a great pity, for it did harm, and made him abuse many great gifts that God had given him."

In some respects we know more than did the faithful servant and biographer. He tells, with his usual skill for dramatic

narrative, how, one night in 1530, at Southwell Castle, on Corpus Christi Eve, he had to wake up his master, because two gentlemen had come riding post-haste from London and desired speedy admittance to him; they were the bearers of an "instrument" to which the Cardinal put his signature and seal. Had he been able to read the "instrument", Cavendish would have experienced the shock of his life; his master, whom he thought opposed to the king's divorce, had added his name, and the weight of his titles, to a petition which was sent to Clement VII on 13 July. The petition reads in fact more like an admonition: let Clement grant the king's request, or else God knows what his angered bishops and barons are going to do! Wolsey, no longer England's Chancellor, was still its only Cardinal, and proud Norfolk acknowledged that this made him rank above a duke; his signature was worth having: he gave it, however reluctantly, rather than wade further into the King's displeasure. This was nine months after his fall, and a bare four months before his death. The letter, also signed by Archbishop Warham, the two dukes and many important people, brought forth a stern rebuke from the Pope on 27 September.

But Cavendish was not privy to such secret matters. He was sincere in trying to clear Wolsey's memory from the suspicion that he had launched the whole divorce affair to satisfy his own dislike of Catherine's imperial nephew. He has at least succeeded in proving that the unpopular minister was no blind heartless juggernaut, but a human being, ready to laugh a bit too loud in his palmy days, readier to cry and whimper when bitten by the frost of ingratitude, and paying henceforth more than lip-homage to God who, he confessed, was calling him home to himself before it was too late. It is to Cavendish that we owe our only account of Wolsey's last moments: "He would not have given me over in my grey hairs." This is at least as good as "naked to mine enemies": did Shakespeare alter the original simply for prosodic reasons? Or did his searching genius detect in the depths of Wolsey's soul the fear of being exposed, which would explain his morbid craving for the robes of office?

At any rate the poet's image has caught the fancy of Ferguson, who uses it constantly as the key to the mystery of his hero. His choice of it for a title is more than a trick for ringing a

bell and using the appeal of learned reminiscence. It may have been suggested to him by the slab over the Cardinal's tomb in the ruins of St Mary's, Leicester. But his whole book justifies the title, by illustrating Wolsey's—and Henry's—constant need of a costume and a mask, a "visor", Cavendish says, to cloak and hide their unavowable motives and aims.

Much as Ferguson, like any modern biographer of Wolsey, owes to Cavendish, there are many picturesque and telling details which he unfortunately leaves out. Not that we wish he had done no selecting at all: art feeds on sacrifice; but the space reclaimed through this sacrifice he devotes to conjectures about the little known Ipswich boy, the hardly better known Oxford scholar and Magdalen schoolmaster, and generally about the obscure years before Wolsey had "once cast anchor in the port of promotion" and begun to fill with his presence the annals of England, and indeed of Christendom.

British writers generally assume that the background of their heroes is familiar to the reader. Americans do not take this for granted; they generally take great pains to introduce their public to the conditions and atmosphere of the place and the period into which their personage was born. It is no easy task to make people of the New World familiar with early Tudor England, or with an East Anglian market-town in days when Christopher Columbus had hardly begun to dream of sailing westwards to new shores. To make up for the lack of documents on young Thomas, the author quotes extensively, but rather indiscriminatingly, from the Ipswich archives, and from fifteenth-century behaviour-books. I think he goes a little too far in pressing more evidence from these two sources than they really contain.

From the scarcity of information given by the Ipswich town chronicler on the Wars of the Roses he infers, for instance, that the people of England were not interested in the bloody games of their kings and king-makers. Now, if we applied the same rule to our own times, and glanced through the municipal records or the private correspondence of English people in the summer of 1959, the startlingly few allusions to President Eisenhower's tour of the Western capitals, or to Chairman Khrushchev's holiday in the States, might be construed to evince

widespread indifference to the movements or the moves of leading statesmen.

The behaviour books of the period concerned are gathered in *Early English Meals and Manners*, edited for the E.E.T.S. in 1868 by Fr J. Furnival. Ferguson draws with evident pleasure from this collection. But a good deal has been discovered on the subject in the past ninety years. And, more fundamentally, when reading a manual of good manners, one must bear in mind that its purpose is didactic and that most teachers will not stick at stating, or even stressing, the obvious. Take, for instance, the amusing item where servants are requested "not to shoot their stern guns". That they needed this warning makes the well-groomed reader of 1959 feel very superior. But he is grossly mistaken if he fancies that all servants, or even that some of them, were ready, unless duly warned against it, to shoot their stern guns whenever they felt like it. In fact, the very substitution of a naval image to the monosyllabic verb used in mediaeval English and still enjoyed by Thomas More betrays a certain refinement. To take one more example from our own experience, the London Transport authorities still deem it necessary to write the familiar direction: "Do not spit: £5". Suppose, now, that a rusty double-decker is unearthed by some fortieth-century archaeologist; if he can decipher the old inscription, he may well describe the twentieth-century Londoners as inveterate spitters: so urgent was their itch to use the floor of the bus as a *crachoir*, he will say to an amazed audience, that they had to be deterred by a heavy fine. The same tendency to take nothing for granted accounts for the panel hanging in many sacristies, and not in Britain alone, "informing" the visitor, as he vests for mass, that "nomen Papae" is "Joannes": if some future historian assumes that such a "tip" is really needed, he will have tales to tell about the ignorance of priests in the days of Pope John.

What Maynard says about the "clerical" stamp on the whole personality of Cranmer might apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to Thomas Wolsey. He does not seem to have hesitated before choosing the Church as a profession. He was still a young man when he was raised to the priesthood on 3 March 1498, two weeks before John Colet, who was then in his thirties, and three

months before John Skelton, who was in his late forties. Wolsey was more like Fisher and Erasmus in this respect than most of his famous English confrères: Warham, Tunstal, Linacre, Pole, or the two Cardinals who were his frequent partners, Campeggio and Duprat, who were both widowers and "late vocations". Outwardly he was much more of an ecclesiastic than any of these: whether we consider his unctuous way of styling himself "your loving and humble priest" (to Bishop Foxe in 1511) or "your humble chaplain and bedesman" (to King Henry, invariably), or whether we consider his fondness for crosses, processions, blessings of crowds with indulgences, parading in pontifical garments, and finally his consistently Ultramontane politics at a time when the inconsistency of Roman diplomacy would have discouraged any less determined supporter.

England, when Wolsey entered the scene, was less ridden with clerical abuse than France or Italy. He himself set the example for every form of corruption that he found thriving elsewhere. A nepotist, he heaped preferment on his own natural son Thomas Winter, whom he even tried to make bishop of Durham when he was only a student of eighteen. A pluralist and absenteeist, "he never so much as saw any one of the Cathedrals of the five sees which he occupied" (Philip Hughes, *Reformation in England*, Vol. I, p. 112); and, besides daily encroaching, as Legate, on the jurisdiction of his fellow-bishops and of religious superiors, he was, at the time of his fall, the Ordinary of one third of England. Simony he practised shamelessly, especially when he tried to buy for himself the triple crown, or to bribe support of the Cardinals for the King's divorce. And hardly had the fifth Lateran Council renewed the prohibition for a secular priest to rule an abbey when Wolsey appointed himself abbot *in commendam* of St Alban's, which, from the standpoint of income, was worth more than many a bishopric.

His faults and vices were so conspicuous, so glaring, that one feels tempted to attribute selfish motives to practically everything he did. Was he really the friend of the poor when, in Chancery or the Star Chamber, he showed partiality to them? Was he not rather an enemy of the rich and the lords, because these despised and resisted him? Again his adherence to the

shifting politics of four successive Popes, often at the cost of England, appears to have been dictated, perhaps unconsciously, by his ambition and hope to be the Supreme Pontiff of tomorrow.

Yet Ferguson, after a thirty years' intimacy with Wolsey, joins Cavendish in pleading not guilty for him in the matter of the King's divorce. He thinks that "he had the full right to pronounce judgement himself", but he chose to "lay the matter in the lap of the pope" out of genuine loyalty to the Holy See, and fully aware of the heavy risks he was running. This to his biographer, who does not hold Rome to be the centre of Christendom, was one more blunder, but at least it was a noble one. Such lofty motivation is not, however, proved by any document, and seems little in keeping with the inglorious fawning of the fallen minister. Campeggio, an expert canon-lawyer, must have made it clear to his fellow-judge, that their right to pass sentence was limited by the papal commission, and indeed Wolsey made this clear when the court was prorogued in July 1529.

The final verdict is therefore likely to remain severe. The divorce was not the only reason for Wolsey's fall. His first capacity as a state official had been the war ministry, and war remained his favourite game, because it gave ample scope to his ability, and because he could fish freely in its troubled waters. His last pet war, that of 1528, against England's traditional and necessary ally—when not only the heart but the purse of the nation sided with Spain and Flanders—was also his most unpopular enterprise, and his most spectacular fiasco. It set almost every Englishman praying heartily either to the King or to Heaven to rid them at last of the Cardinal. Cavendish found the Protestants, and also his fellow-Catholics, unfairly harsh on Wolsey, especially because they fathered on him the initiative of the divorce and consequently the responsibility for the Anglican schism. He was indirectly responsible at least for the latter. Had he been in the eighteen years of his dictatorship another Fisher, or even another Warham, the anti-clericalism of the Commons in November 1529 would have been less loud; Henry would not have dared to use it as a weapon to enslave the Church. As Pollard writes in his *Henry VIII*, page 216, "he rode papal jurisdiction in England to its death". "Such had been his career," Hughes writes in his turn, "that the Cardinal may

be said to have created, in almost all its parts, the king's opportunity . . . and trained most of his agents" (op. cit., p. 109). Catholics still find it difficult not to curse him for it.

St Thomas More, who had been his collaborator for fourteen years before succeeding him in the Chancellorship—an office Wolsey had also ridden to exhaustion—sets the right note, one of pity for the huge waste of wealth, talent and energy. "Our Lord assoil his soul!" he writes to Meg Roper from the Tower (Rogers, p. 518), prayerfully, and therefore confidently. The proud prelate, who had chosen nature for his seeding ground, reaped from nature a bitter harvest, a tangle of nettles and thorns. Much of his arrogance was killed by the triple fang of age, illness, and, worst of all, the King's displeasure. He was capable now of gestures of kindness and courtesy which to his household seemed incredible. He confirmed more children in one week in the North than he had done in the rest of his life. To his various hosts he showed such gratitude as Henry VIII does not seem to have ever expressed.

It may be useful, as a conclusion, to point out a number of verbal or factual inaccuracies in *Naked to Mine Enemies*.

Page 69 contains an error to be found in nearly all chronologies, including the tables of Philip Hughes in his *Popular History of the Catholic Church* (p. 261). Alexander VI is made to reign eleven years: 1492-1503, whereas in fact his reign lasted a little less than ten years. There was an interval of more than thirteen months between his death (18 August 1502) and the election of Pius III (22 September 1503).

Page 119: "All bishops took two contradictory oaths." Did they? Did St John Fisher, who died rather than forswear, see any contradiction between loyalty to the Pope and loyalty to the King? Surely he knew the meaning of words, both in Latin and in English.

Pages 127 and 190: "priests in minor orders" are supposed to have a "sacerdotal character". This sort of slip, on points widely known even to non-Catholics, is less excusable than the author's confusion of Star Chamber and Chancery, which, for a foreigner, may be considered as technicalities of the law.

Page 181: Luther lists "ninety-five defiant reasons for condemning a practice sanctioned by His Holiness". This is doubly

wrong: not every practice of Tetzl and his fellow-"pardoners" was sanctioned by His Holiness; and not every one of Luther's theses was directly concerned with this single abuse of indulgences.

Page 267: Giulio de' Medici, later to become Clement VII, was not the nephew of Leo X, but his cousin.

Page 277: Tunstal was not yet bishop of London when, in the summer of 1521, Henry VIII sent him to Bruges to borrow the Great Seal from the Cardinal. Bishop Fitzjames died only in January 1522, and Tunstal, appointed soon afterwards, was consecrated in October 1522.

Page 338: "A procedure for relief from undesirable marriages existed in canonical practice; it was exercised everyday"; and page 339: "Annulments as common and as cheap as Indulgences." This, in spite of a certain flippancy in the tone, implies no anti-Catholic bias. It is bound, however, to hurt Catholic readers. The pity is that much-rumoured dispensations and annulments, granted to crowned plaintiffs by awed or bribed tribunals, should have given this lamentable impression, not only to modern historians, but also to the European courts of the Renaissance days.

Page 354: Fisher, in 1527, was "approaching three score years and ten". In fact he was only fifty-eight. Fisher is one of the few prominent figures of that age whose birth-year, 1469, is known with precision. For More, hesitation is still possible between 1478, the date commonly given since Seeböhm and Bridgett, and 1477, for which there is a good deal to say. As for Wolsey's birth, Ferguson dates it as early as March 1471; Pollard and Sylvester prefer late 1472 or early 1473; Bindoff (*Penguin Tudor*) says 1474, Hughes and Harrison come as far down as 1475.

These are just a sampling of the sort of inaccuracies which betray the amateur historian, even though they do not altogether mar the soundness of the information as a whole, or the substantial fidelity of the portrait.

The champions of the Queen's English, "pure and undefiled", have an easy task in denouncing the many flaws in Ferguson's highly idiosyncratic mixture of pseudo-archaisms such as "college abuilding" and genuine Yankeeisms of the "right queasy"

type. It would be idle for a foreigner to disagree: but I feel sure that most native users of English have enjoyed the blend without undue scruples. The author puns very freely, on Wolsey and the woolsack, on his scarlet sins and his cardinal blunders: some of the jokes go back to the satires of Skelton and Barlow. He is also fond of alliteration, with startling pairings at times, e.g. page 317: "bless her tender and usable young heart and hide . . ." This approach to English is more faithful to early Tudor prose than any stage Tudorism: More and Tyndale would not object.

Ferguson has incurred the wrath of at least one reviewer by daring to write of Wolsey that his Grace "howled like a stuck pig". Most readers, I hope, have thought the comparison appropriate and felicitous. The pig image aptly describes the noisy angers of the blustering butcher's lad. And it gives authentic "local colour" to the book, for animal images came natural to the minds of those days. Richard III was the Hog. Luther in the first bull directed against him was "a wild boar". Julius II, "servus servorum", became "cervus cervorum" in the 1511 French play by Pierre Gringore, *Le Cerf des Cerfs*, the Stag which royal hunters must soon bring to bay. Anne Bullen's name conjured up, in the popular imagination, and in Wolsey's superstitious soul too, a prediction concerning a "bull" and a "dun cow". St Thomas More would no doubt have supported the "howling pig" unreservedly: he himself makes the "silly souls" in purgatory, some of them right honourable citizens in their lifetime, write to their friends on earth that Tyndale, Fish and Co. "fume, fret, and foam as fiercely and as angrily as a new hunted sow." (*The Supplication of Souls*, 1529, fol. XIII, with spelling modernized.) This, written by Mr Chancellor of the Duchy, a few months before he became Lord High Chancellor, is enough to prove that Ferguson's stylistic liberties have a long tradition behind them.

ABBÉ G. MARC'HADOUR

THE FAITH AND TELEVISION

THE coming of television has brought about a revolution in the habits of ordinary people which for speed and completeness has few parallels in history. Most inventions which have ultimately benefited mankind have been met with suspicion at first and only gradually accepted. A glance at the skyline of any small English town or suburb of an industrial city, its roofs bristling with television aerials like static antennae in a surrealist painting, is evidence that the British public has already taken television to its hearths and homes. The figure is literally true, for the really novel element in the whole operation of television is not merely the simultaneous broadcasting of sight as well as of sound, but the fact that these are presented in a domestic setting. The goggle-box is part of the furniture of the living-room, and the easy chairs surround it in a semi-circle, paying homage. When television was first introduced to this country it was assumed that the medium was much the same as the cinema and much the same technique could be used in presenting programmes; it took producers and technicians some time to realize that the difference was not only one of scale but that the new medium by its very nature demanded a new method of approach and technique. Both B.B.C. and I.T.V. continue regularly to present films made for the cinema as television programmes which appear on the television screen with varying degrees of flatness and artificiality, emphasizing the point that good cinema does not always make good television.

This comparison between the cinema and television is a useful one when we are thinking about the nature of the latter and the question of its particular appeal. It is fatal to think in terms of the size of audiences; to say, for instance, that while three thousand people can simultaneously see a film in a cinema, as many millions will be watching a programme on television. In fact the television audience is the smallest and most intimate in the world, five or six persons in the privacy of the home. It is true that the aggregate of such audiences will have seen the same programme, but that is an effect, it can never be a cause. After six or more years of learning the techniques, no actor or

speaker on television would dream of telling himself he was addressing seven million people when in fact he is talking to half a dozen. The glamour of the footlights, the darkened hush of the cinema, are not there to aid him with their magic, he has to insinuate himself among the familiar objects of the parlour, into the informality of the living-room. Television is not a mass medium, the mouthings and gesticulations of a Hitler would be reduced to the ludicrous on the screen. Spectacular films, *Ben Hur* or *The Ten Commandments* come to mind, produce an effect when reduced to the television screen of a commotion in an ant-hill, and I am not at all sure that the answer is, "wait till we get colour television". I have a pretty strong idea that you can't reduce *Gone with the Wind* to the proportions of a peep-show and get away with it, whether in colour or in black-and-white.

Oddly enough the objection does not equally apply to the televising of great public occasions. The funeral of Pius XII, the coronation of John XXIII and of Elizabeth II came over on the small screen without much loss of impressiveness, and I think the effectiveness of these programmes lies in the fact of their being "live". In cinema the setting of the action is depicted, you don't have to supply it from the imagination, the work of the producer is to create the illusion that it is perfectly natural, and it is this, I think, which on the television screen makes the effect of unreality. In the "live" programme on the other hand the mind is saying all the time, "this is real, you are looking at something which is happening now", and the imagination fills out the image on the screen with a new dimension of actuality. It makes no difference if in fact the actuality has been pre-filmed and the programme presented after the event has taken place; with the new methods of recording it is impossible to tell whether a film is interposing itself between the viewer and the event; what contributes to the impact is, I think, first, the reality of the event itself, i.e. the participants are not consciously addressing themselves to an unseen audience, but doing what they have to do irrespective of the onlooker, then the technique of the camera-men, and above all the subjective certainty of the viewer that the scene is a real and not an artificial one.

None the less, I think it is gradually becoming clear that by

far the most effective television programme is the one in which two or three performers against a background in which visual effects have been reduced to bare essentials take the audience into their confidence and talk as one would to a small circle of intimate friends in a small room. In the heyday of its beginnings producers fell victims to the temptation of trying to present something like the transformation scenes which were the joy of our youth at the old-fashioned pantomime. Lately, a more sober mood has set in and with great advantage. It is true that the medium is both visual and auditory, but the wise producer is beginning to realize that the technique called for is to present what is significant to eye and ear with great economy, emphasizing its value by a background of sound and sight that is discreet, even flat. Opinions differ about the relative values of the visual and the auditory; an interesting exercise is to tune down the sound in a programme, leaving only the visual, and again to close one's eyes and to listen only to the sound. It is only very rarely that the sound without the sight becomes unintelligible, but most frequently that the sight without the sound is meaningless. Certainly for the purposes of religious television sound is all-important; faith, we know, comes by hearing. Sight is a valuable aid to understanding, but the truths of faith cannot be communicated by sight only but by the spoken or written word. It seems to me that here we have an analogy with the Gospels. For St John our Lord's miracles were *semeia*, visual signs which attested the truth of His teaching; in communicating religious truths on television the function of the visual is that of giving impressiveness and actuality to what is being said. This gives the producer of a Catholic programme a long start, for our understanding of our Faith is of necessity deeply coloured by sacramental theology, the belief that the conjunction of matter and form produces the effective sign. To a mind trained in this way of thought the task of communicating truths of the Faith by simultaneous sound and sight ought not to present a difficult problem.

There are, broadly speaking, three types of programme by means of which religious truth can be conveyed on television. The first, by presenting the Liturgy as it is carried out in church or cathedral, in a variety of forms, from the Pontifical High

Mass to a simple Dialogue Mass in a small church. To the non-Catholic viewer, surprisingly enough, the former is the more significant, and I know of at least one conversion to the Faith of which the televising of the Coronation of the Pope was the instrumental cause; the latter is the source of consolation to the invalid and otherwise house-bound Catholic. Whatever form of the Liturgy is chosen, the televising of Mass can be the most effective and valuable means of teaching, both for children and adults, that can be imagined, and for this reason as well as for the sake of the non-Catholic viewer a commentator is indispensable. Time and again one meets with people who speak with enthusiasm and gratitude for the clearer understanding of the Mass they have derived from watching television on a Sunday morning, and this alone would dispose of the rather improbable fear that some may imagine it possible to fulfil the obligation of being present at Mass on Sundays by watching a television set. On the contrary, there is evidence to show that the chance viewing on television of once familiar sights and sounds has been in many cases the occasion of the return of lapsed Catholics to their religious duties.

If the Mass is to be televised in such a way that its meaning is conveyed with the highest significance to Catholic and non-Catholic viewers alike, a close co-operation between parish priest, commentator and producer is called for which may necessitate many hours of thought and rehearsal beforehand. It is not merely a matter of putting cameras in strategic positions in the church and of letting them do their work while Mass is being celebrated; it is the work of the producer to ensure that the cameras are presenting the Mass in the most significant way to those who are watching it around the set in their own home. What is coming across on the screen is an interpretation of the Mass, and there are almost limitless possibilities for the Catholic producer to show the significant image with perfect timing. An example will serve to illustrate what I mean here. Some years ago Mass was being televised from a London church on the Feast of St Michael the Archangel; the celebrant was reading the Gospel which contains the passage, "and Jesus, calling unto Him a little child, set him in the midst of them and said: Amen I say to you, unless you be converted and become as little

children you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven". It was that moment that the producer chose to sweep the camera round on the congregation and pin-point a woman standing, listening to the reading of the Gospel with a small child in her arms. It is this kind of image which remains fixed in the mind, and the good producer who knows the Mass, who has studied the church in which it is taking place, and the congregation which has gathered to participate, can multiply the opportunities for presenting such sudden insights on the screen, leaving unforgettable images in the minds of viewers. No other programme that our religion can provide has the appeal which the Mass makes to the viewer; an impression which is matter-of-fact and yet mysterious, brief, yet leaving a sense of timelessness. I am convinced that in the long run it is by televising the Mass that we shall sow the seeds of an abundant harvest of conversions. It was by depriving the people of the Mass that this country was robbed of the Faith, and when the Mass has once again become a familiar sight and sound the way for the return of the Faith will have been prepared.

Of programmes consisting of straight talks in which a single speaker directly addresses the audience or of discussions between two or more speakers to which the audience is, as it were, admitted, little need be said. It is personality which counts here and few have the ability to hold the screen alone for half an hour without inducing viewers to switch over to the other channel.

The third type of programme, the potentialities of which have not yet seriously been considered by those responsible for putting on Catholic programmes is what one may call, for want of a better term, the dramatization of the Christian life. By this I do not mean religious drama of the beard and blanket type, a pale imitation of the productions of Cecil B. de Mille, but the dramatization of situations in the lives of ordinary people, the point being to show that the practice of the Faith is relevant to human problems. "Living Your Life" is the title of a series of programmes presented by one of the programme companies and it suggests that this is the approach intended rather than one of mere discussion. Strangely enough, one of the most effective forms which such a programme can take is

one in which the actors present the situation in dumb-show while a commentator indicates the point in question, a method which, at its best, combines the advantages of both the direct and indirect approaches, and it has the added advantage of not requiring a cast of professional actors. Most large centres in England and Wales have their amateur dramatic societies which include numbers of Catholics among their members, and it is certainly not beyond the powers of amateurs to present this kind of programme. There must be many such who would welcome the opportunity of using their talents and training in an apostolic way. The difficulty hitherto has been to find script-writers who are prepared to think about the relevance of the Faith to human life and have the ability to compose a script which would convey the point with the maximum of dramatic impact. You might expect to find some among the younger generation of University Graduates in Literature who would be full of enthusiasm to use their knowledge for such a purpose, but the response so far has been disappointing.

It is part of the legacy handed down from days when Catholics in this country were but a tiny minority which makes us approach great organizations like the B.B.C. or Independent Television with diffidence as though we were unsure of a welcome; three years as adviser to the Independent Television Authority entailing frequent meetings with directors and producers of the televising companies has taught me that there is absolutely no ground for such a fear. The attitude to the Church on the part of those responsible for religious television on the independent channels can be summed up in a phrase used the other day by one of the most outstanding producers: "We want to know what you want to do; we want to show you how to do it." The current Training Course in Television for the Clergy is sufficient proof that the invitation is sincerely meant and the purpose a serious one. Attending the course for Catholic clergy last June, I gained the very clear impression that everyone, directors, producers and technicians, was taking tremendous pains to impart knowledge of all that goes to make up a television programme, and a training in the practical use of it. It was a spectacle of science and art placed at the service of religion.

It is perhaps early days to form any very clear-cut ideas of how we are to present the Faith by means of television; a great deal will depend on our knowledge of the audience to which we are addressing ourselves. The statisticians tell us that the Sunday morning services are watched by half-a-million people, the evening programme by five million; that is, in sheer numbers alone, many hundred times more than any Catholic organization has ever, even in times of its greatest success, been able to address. In the very nature of things the majority of the audience will be non-Catholic and working-class, but will be composed of small and autonomous units none of more than a dozen people, most of a family of five or six. This suggests that our task is to address ourselves to a non-Catholic working-class family, comfortably off, taking its Sunday evening recreation in the home, expecting to get entertainment from the screen. Its members will be quick to recognize and reject the half-baked ideas of a slovenly programme, quick to detect insincerity or playing for effect which comes to the same thing on the screen on the part of a speaker. Yet they are ready to watch a religious programme, five million of them. Has the opportunity for apostolic work on such a scale ever presented itself to the Church since its beginning?

My own view is that for the present, at least, we should be expecting too much by looking to television as an instrument for the conversion of non-Catholics. That is in any case a work which only grace and the good will of the individual can do; the third party can do no more than create the atmosphere in which it will be easier for a non-Catholic to embrace the gift of Faith offered, and this instrumentality will have varying degrees of effectiveness. The priest who is instructing a convert is really doing no more than this, the same priest and those who are co-operating with him in the production of a programme on television are doing no less. Our non-Catholic brethren live in a mental atmosphere of mistrust and misapprehension of the nature of the Catholic Church, an atmosphere which four hundred years of misrepresentation and anti-Catholic propaganda have created. Every convert knows how very difficult it is to move outside that atmosphere and see the Church with an undistorted vision. He has had experience of the normal ways

of thought of the non-Catholic and understands how the Church is regarded with suspicion by those outside it. To them we are just "the Romans", people who unaccountably choose to live under an intellectual and moral tyranny. By showing Catholics to be normal, intelligent and responsible people the television programme will have begun to disperse this atmosphere, preparing the way for a more direct communication of the Faith at a later stage. The very name "Pope" had sinister overtones to the average non-Catholic; the televising of the coronation of John XXIII has pierced these dark shadows, leaving a new image, that of a Father, kindly and solicitous for his people, and what has even more significance for an English mind, a man with a considerable sense of humour. The effect of that programme has been incalculable. If we can gradually communicate the idea that their Faith makes Catholics more human, kindlier, more understanding, better balanced; that all that the non-Catholic values most highly in personal as in social life comes to him ultimately because the Church has preserved it, and without the Church it would be lost to the human race for ever; that the answers to the ultimate human problems are to be found in the Church and only there, then we shall have created a *praeparatio evangelica*, an atmosphere of thought and opinion in which grace can operate. I think we ought not to look for more than this at the moment, nor imagine that we can communicate the Faith directly to minds which are as yet unprepared to receive it; but this in itself is a task of very great magnitude, and if we can achieve it the way will have been prepared for the return of the Faith to this country.

There is one other type of home which is reached through the television screen, that of the lapsed Catholic, as often as not one founded on an invalid marriage. Every priest knows how difficult it almost always is to gain the entry into such a family circle, or even having gained it, to create an atmosphere of charity and understanding in which the position can be explained or discussed with any reasonable chance of setting matters right. Yet Sunday by Sunday this family will gather around the television screen and for half an hour we have the opportunity of placing the true position before them with the fair possibility of being accorded a hearing, and more than a

THE CLERGY REVIEW

hearing if a well-devised programme is presented emphasizing the fundamental unhappiness and unreality of such marriages. A kindred opportunity is opened to us by participation in the "Sunday Break" programme of A.B.C. Television, watched by millions of adolescents every week, many of them lapsed Catholics. Our endeavour in this programme should be to encourage the viewer to ask himself the question "Why am I here? What is life for?", and to discover again that the only answer is the one learned long ago in the Catechism, "To know, love and serve God in this world and to be happy with Him for ever in the next". Though in neither case a direct conversion may result, a question has been asked which will not lightly be forgotten and may lead the enquirer to make contact with a practising Catholic and ultimately with the priest.

Such experience as we have already and such thinking as we have been able to do about television point to the same conclusion, namely, that we have in our hands an instrument of communication of almost limitless possibilities. Is it not, therefore, a clear duty upon the clergy in particular but upon Catholic lay-people as well to think about television as a means of apostolic work and how it can best be used for the purpose, and for those who have the capability to offer their services to one of the regional Catholic programme advisers? There is not one but many fields of activity open to us and all of great value; the sending in of ideas for programmes, script-writing or even the more humble task of watching programmes and reporting on their effectiveness or the lack of it. If it be objected that these activities are properly engaged in only by those who have had specialist training, I would answer that, at least, all of us can pray that the work of those engaged in presenting Catholic programmes may be furthered by grace and be blessed by an abundant harvest.

G. A. TOMLINSON

SHARING IN MASS BY ATTITUDE
AND GESTURE

IN his address to the participants in the Assisi Liturgical Congress (1956) the late Pope Pius XII pointed out that the sharing of the people in the Liturgy should be a conscious, intelligent, active participation, and this same participation is the subject matter of the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation for Rites, *Sacred Music and Liturgy*, issued on 3 September 1958.

An active, intelligent sharing in the Mass by the congregation demands not only speech and song but also attitude and ritual gesture. Speaking of the external elements of worship Pius XII said—*Mediator Dei*, §107: "the object of all this is to emphasize the majesty of the great Sacrifice and, by these visible signs of religion and devotion, to stimulate the minds of the faithful to contemplate the sublime realities that lie hidden within this Sacrifice". And the *S.R.C.* Instruction (§22) remarks: "the participation of those present [at Mass] is more complete, if *external* participation is added to internal attention, that is sharing shown by external actions, such as bodily posture (kneeling, standing, sitting) or by ritual gestures, and especially by the responses, prayers, and song".

The Oxford Dictionary defines "attitude" as "a posture of the body proper to or implying some action or mental state", and "gesture" as "a movement expressive of thought and feeling". Attitude and gesture are a second form of speech—often more eloquent than the voice—a natural, instinctive way of displaying thought and emotion; they emphasize, intensify, interpret, vivify the spoken word. When people are actively engaged in doing something, something in which they are really interested, they naturally express their inner feelings, with or without words, by attitude and gesture—men are not robots—and these exterior acts deepen and interpret the activity of the soul. And so from the earliest times attitude and gesture were part of Christian worship—as they had been of pagan and Jewish worship—not only for the sacred ministers and their assistants but also for the people (the *circumstantes*). They stood erect with hands and eyes upraised, or arms extended cross-

wise, facing East; they knelt or bowed low or prostrated themselves, they signed their foreheads with the cross. The early Christians so acted because they realized the nature and value of corporate worship externally manifested. When active participation died away and was replaced by ignorance and apathy the correct ritual attitudes and gestures faded away also, leaving just slight traces behind.

To employ correct attitudes and gestures at community worship is not a matter of indifference. Their use is a form of self-discipline imposing on the body movements conformable to the needs of the spirit, externalizing the processes of intellect and will.

The main attitudes of Catholic worship that concern the people are standing, kneeling and sitting.

Standing is the normal traditional Christian attitude of liturgical prayer—derived from Jewish practice—used from the beginning of Christianity and exemplified by the early illustrations of the *orante* in the Roman catacombs, standing erect with arms outstretched. Standing erect is an attitude of freedom and joy proper to those ennobled by membership of the Mystical Body, enjoying the liberty of the children of God. At worship standing is an attitude of: (i) activity and vigilant attention, (ii) respect towards a superior. For song it is a natural attitude to adopt: *sic stemus ad psallendum ut mens nostra concordet voci nostrae*, wrote St Benedict in his Rule.

For the early Christians the attitude all through a liturgical function (except on certain penitential days) was standing¹; they knelt for private prayer, but only public sinners (*genuflecti*) knelt during the Liturgy. Indeed from the time of the Council of Nicea (325) there was a rule forbidding people to kneel at worship during Paschaltide—a season of joy—and on Sundays, when the Resurrection is commemorated. And so the people should, normally, stand (a) for the communal prayers which the celebrant says on their behalf (Collect, Secret, Preface, Post-communion), and for the texts they recite with him (*Kyrie eleison, Gloria in excelsis, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei, Pater noster*); (b) out of respect for the celebrant, as he comes to the altar and

¹ Even Holy Communion was received standing up till about the ninth century, later in some places.

departs from it, and whenever he directly addresses them (at *Dominus vobiscum, Orate, fratres*).

Kneeling, an attitude used in Jewish worship and by Christians from the earliest times for private prayer, is an expression of:

(a) humble adoration, special reverence, and earnest supplication, and so is used at the Consecration of Mass and in prayer immediately directed to the Blessed Sacrament;

(b) penitence and penance, and so on days of penance in the Liturgy, often in answer to the summons *Flectamus genua*, those taking part in Mass kneel for the Collect and Post-communion, and from after the Consecration until *Pax Domini*;

(c) Mourning, accordingly, at the same parts of a Requiem Mass those present kneel.

Sitting during a liturgical function by the ministers of the Church denotes authority and so the bishop may sit when preaching or administering Confirmation, for example; a priest sits when giving absolution. For the congregation sitting is not only an attitude of relaxation and repose, but is also expressive of a receptive mind and of contemplative attention. Accordingly those present at Mass sit: (a) to listen to the lessons from Sacred Scripture, and the homily (b) at those parts of the chanting which are not intended, normally, to be sung by the entire congregation, but are sung by the special choir (*schola cantorum*) that they may be listened to and help people to meditate on the readings which they have just heard, (c) (by custom) at those parts of the Mass which have less concern for them, i.e. during the Offertory (when the celebrant is reciting prayers that are not congregational) and during the ablutions. For many centuries those present at Mass (including the clergy who were not *in functione*) did not sit at all, except the aged and the sick. Seats for the general congregation did not come into use until the thirteenth century and were not common until the fifteenth or sixteenth century.

The chief ritual gestures that concern the congregation are genuflecting, bowing, striking the breast, joining the hands and making the sign of the Cross.

A *genuflection* was in pagan times a gesture of adoration; then in early Christian centuries, especially from the fifth or sixth

century, it lost this meaning and became a gesture of mere respect, hence its use even now as a salutation to a high ecclesiastical dignitary, such as the Pope or the bishop of the diocese. By a curious development from the thirteenth or fourteenth century it again took on the meaning of a gesture of adoration in reference to the Blessed Sacrament.¹ Genuflecting, then, is a gesture of: (a) homage and supplication, and so its use to honour the mystery of the Incarnation (e.g. in the Nicene Creed) and for the Blessed Sacrament, for the altar cross sometimes, for a relic of the true Cross; (b) reverence, and therefore it is used by some in saluting the altar *in functione*, and as a gesture of respect to the Pope or the bishop, as the representatives of our Lord; (c) humility and repentance—its original meaning—and so its use, e.g., in answer to *Flectamus genua* or at the words *Adjuva nos* of the Lenten Tract.

Bowing is a mark of: (a) respect, and so, e.g., preceded genuflecting as a mark of reverence to the Blessed Sacrament; (b) the spirit of penance and of humble submission and therefore it is used, e.g., at the *Confiteor*, or in reply to the admonition *Humiliate capita vestra Deo* of ferial Masses in Lent.

Striking the breast is a natural gesture of sorrow, humility and repentance. Hence its use in the Mass by the people at the *Confiteor*, *Agnus Dei* and *Domine, non sum dignus*.

Joining the hands at prayer—either palm to palm or with fingers intertwined—is a late liturgical gesture, not found in general use much before the twelfth century, and seems to have originated from the Teutonic form of an oath of fealty by a vassal to his lord, when the subject, kneeling, placed his joined hands between those of his master, as a newly ordained priest places his joined hands between those of the bishop when promising obedience to his Ordinary. This gesture of joined hands expresses: (a) submission and recognition of superiority, (b) recollection and respectful attention.

The sign of the cross was used in private prayer at least from the second or third centuries. It was at first made on the forehead with the thumb or index finger, and it marked the person

¹ It makes its first appearance for the celebrant of Mass in Burchard's *Ordo Missæ* (1502) and of obligation only after the publication of the first official edition of the Roman Missal in 1570.

as belonging to Christ (*signum Christi, trophaeum*). From the fourth or fifth century, in private prayer, the small cross was made on the lips and breast also. In the Liturgy the small cross on the forehead is noted from about the eighth century; two centuries later there is evidence of its use on both forehead and breast, but only in the twelfth century was it made on the lips also.

The large sign of the cross, made at first with the three longest fingers only, the hand passing from the right to the left shoulder (in the way that Eastern Catholics still make it), was in private use from the fifth century. There was an accompanying form of words which at first varied but eventually was fixed at the words *In the name of the Father*, etc., inspired by the baptismal rite. In the Liturgy the large sign of the cross does not appear until about the tenth century. At first its use was monastic only, but it gradually spread in the Roman rite and is found at Mass in Burchard's *Ordo* (1502). Only from about the thirteenth century was the whole hand used in making the cross, and, after a period when the hand was passed either from right to left or vice versa, it became fixed in its present form in the Latin Church. The large sign of the cross is, of course, a profession of faith in the doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity, and an invocation of the power of the cross of Christ.

The small sign of the cross is used at Mass by the people at the beginning of each Gospel as an indication that they believe in the Gospel, are ready to proclaim and defend it, and love and cherish it. They should use the large sign of the cross whenever the celebrant uses it in the pre-Mass—some six times—and also at *Benedictus* and at the Blessing.

Only once does a rubric of the Missal mention the *circumstantes* at what it calls "private Mass", meaning now a low Mass at which the people take no active part, and at that the rubric says (General Rubrics, xvii, 2) "they kneel all the time, even in Paschaltide, except while the Gospel is read".

For high Mass—solemn or sung—the rubrics make no direct mention of the people; they assume that they do what the clergy in choir do at this Mass.¹ This is regulated by the General

¹ It is interesting to note that Burchard's *Ordo Missae* (1502) gives directions for the people at a high Mass in keeping with the choir ceremonial of the clergy.

Rubrics of the Missal, xvii, 5, 7; by the Ceremonial of Bishops *passim* and by some decisions of the Sacred Congregation for Rites. Some general principles govern the correct behaviour of the congregation at high Mass: (a) "in choro non sedent qui actu cantant" says the rubric (R.G., xvii, 7), and so when the congregation is singing any part of the Mass they should stand. However, by approved usage, when the celebrant sits for the singing of the *Gloria in excelsis* or the Creed, the people may sit also during the time while he is seated; (b) the congregation should be standing, out of respect for the representative of our Lord, as the celebrant comes to the altar and departs from it; (c) the congregation should be standing when directly addressed by the celebrant, as at each *Dominus vobiscum* and *Orate, fratres*; (d) they should also be standing for the celebrant's presidential prayers: the Collect(s), Secret(s) Preface, Postcommunion(s).

In detail, the correct ceremonial for the people at high Mass is this:

Stand for procession of sacred ministers;

If the *Asperges* occurs, stand, bow and make the sign of the cross when sprinkled;

Kneel for the prayers of preparation¹ unless singing the Introit or an introductory hymn;

Stand as celebrant ascends the altar steps;

Sit, if desired, during the incensation of the altar;

Stand while the celebrant recites the Introit, *Kyrie* and *Gloria*;

Sit, if desired, while the celebrant sits for the singing of the *Gloria*;

Stand for *Dominus vobiscum* and Collect(s), (kneel for Collect(s) and Postcommunion(s) at a week-day Mass celebrated in violet vestments or at a Requiem Mass)²;

Sit for the singing of the Epistle and what follows³;

Stand⁴ as the procession moves off to the place of the Gospel;

¹ R.G., xvii, 5; C.E., II, viii, 32.

² R.G., xvii, 5.

³ R.G., xvii, 7.

⁴ The people should not stand for the private reading of the Gospel by the celebrant at a solemn Mass.

Sit for the sermon;

Stand for the recitation and singing of the Creed (sitting, if desired, while the celebrant sits). Genuflect when the words "Et incarnatus", etc., are recited by the celebrant; when they are sung, kneel if standing, bow only if sitting¹;

Stand for *Dominus vobiscum* and *Oremus*;

Sit for the Offertory until the incensation of the clergy;² then stand, and bow before and after having being incensed;

Remain standing until after the singing of *Sanctus*,³ then kneel;

Stand after the Elevation⁴ and remain standing until the Communion (except at week-day Masses in violet vestments and at Requiem Masses when those present should kneel until *Pax Domini* has been sung)⁵;

At Communion: the communicants kneel for *Confiteor*, and all kneel after *Indulgentiam* until the Sacred Hosts have been consumed or put into the tabernacle⁶;

After Communion: the communicants remain kneeling until *Dominus vobiscum*; others sit during the ablutions and *Communio*;

Stand for *Dominus vobiscum* and Postcommunion(s) and dismissal;

Kneel for blessing;

Stand for last Gospel and departure of celebrant.

And what of the dialogue Mass, so-called? The Instruction of 1958 does not give detailed rubrics for the correct ceremonial on the part of the people. It is not necessary that it should. This form of the Mass is, obviously, derived from high Mass, and so it is not difficult to determine the correct attitudes and gestures for those actively taking part in it. They will be the same as at high Mass, the parts sung by the congregation

¹ C.E., II, viii, 53; S.R.C.³ 1421⁸, 1476^{2, 3, 4}, 1570³, 1594², 2960³, 3860. On Christmas Day and 25 March all kneel for these words.

² R.G., xvii, 7.

³ C.E., II, viii, 69.

⁴ *Ritus*, viii, 8.

⁵ R.G., xvii, 5; S.R.G., 3624¹⁰.

⁶ C.E., II, xcix, 3; *Memoriale Rituum*, IV, ii, §1, 14; cf. S.R.C., 2209⁹.

in that form of Mass being recited in common at the dialogue Mass, and so the general rules given above apply to this community Mass, with but slight modification (e.g. there is no incensation, no sitting down during the *Gloria* and *Creed*).

Second only to the thousand-year-old phenomenon of a voiceless congregation at Mass is the phenomenon of an almost immobile congregation. Where there is active, intelligent interest there is movement; where there is boredom and apathy there will often be a lazy immobility. It seems a pity that something more is not done to teach the people the correct attitudes and ritual gestures at Mass; surely those who pride themselves on a knowledge of and conformity with correct social behaviour should not be ignorant of or indifferent towards the etiquette of God's house and of a ceremony in which Christ Himself is the central figure. But the people must needs understand the meaning of and the reasons for what they are called upon to do, then they will gladly co-operate when they realize that not only voice but attitude and gesture are necessary for their active, conscious, intelligent sharing in the divine Mysteries which the Church so ardently desires.

J. B. O'CONNELL

SHORT NOTICE

Catholic Campuses. By Rosemarian Staudacher. Pp. 190. (*Vision Books.* Burns Oates. 12s. 6d.)

WRITTEN particularly for American boys and girls, these stories of Catholic colleges in the United States will be eagerly read also by other English-speaking children, because the author deals with subjects which are of universal interest to the young. Here are great conflagrations (the burning-down of schools included), earthquakes, fights, athletes, redskins and animals. Adventure and excitement crowd the pages, but there is throughout the book a spirit of true Catholicity, the Faith and those who confess it being always in the author's mind. Each of the eleven stories is told in such a manner as to strengthen those ideas of chivalry which exist in germ within the minds of all normal children. Very good pictures make half-page headings to the chapters.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CANON 1014 AND THE MODERN ATTITUDE
TO DIVORCE

A writer in *The Tablet*, 11 July 1959, p. 595, explaining a criticism of the present marriage laws of this country, makes the following comment:

In the great majority of cases, where they are not believing Christians, young people marrying do not have the full Christian intention when they exchange their vows. They intend to do their honest best to see that their marriage is a success, but they hold at the same time that it takes two to make a marriage succeed, while one can wreck it, and that if it is wrecked, they should be free to try again. This, it can be said, is the state of public opinion which the law, broadly speaking, reflects and should reflect. Nothing in the law prevents the Christian minority from living according to its own code. . . .

In view of such revised moral standards, can it be said that canon 1014 is still valid in England? (T. W. B.)

REPLY

Canon 1014: "Matrimonium gaudet favore iuris; quare in dubio standum est pro valore matrimonii, donec contrarium probetur, salvo praescripto can. 1127."

Canon 1084: "Simplex error circa matrimonii . . . indissolubilitatem . . . , etsi det causam contractui, non vitiat consensum matrimoniale."

Canon 1086, §2: "At si alterutra vel utraque pars positivo voluntatis actu excludat . . . essentialem aliquam matrimonii proprietatem, invalide contrahit."

Canon 1092: "Conditio semel apposita et non revocata: . . . 2°. Si de futuro contra matrimonii substantiam, illud reddit invalidum."

However widespread may be the mistaken idea that marriage is intrinsically dissoluble, it is quite certain that the principle enunciated in canon 1014 remains valid in England, as

elsewhere, nor is it easy to see how it could cease to be valid, for it is more or less demanded by the divine law.¹ Marriage, as made by God (and there is no other), is indissoluble for Christians and non-Christians alike, except in the limited circumstances for which provision is made in canons 1119-27; nor can any human power or opinion, individual or collective, make it otherwise, or introduce a legitimate substitute. It is contracted indissolubly, or not at all. Whenever therefore it is established that two persons, *iure habiles*, have exchanged matrimonial consent in legitimate and outwardly valid form, the Church must, out of respect for the divine law, hold them bound by the obligations intrinsic to marriage, until they *prove* that what in fact they consented to was something other than marriage. Were she to concede freedom to them without such proof, she would unwarrantably take the risk of authorizing and supporting a liberty denied them by the divine law. In canon 1014 she does not claim that a doubtfully valid marriage is a marriage, for that would be to belie the evidence; she admits the doubt of fact and awaits its solution; but meanwhile she gives the *favor iuris* to the divine law by placing the *onus probandi* on those who, as far as their *declared* intention goes, have put themselves under that law.

The Church is well aware that many marrying couples, some of them even professed Christians, have erroneous views as to the nature of the contract they enter, but she rightly maintains that "simple error", i.e. error which remains in the mind and does not invade and substantially alter or restrict the will's object of consent, does not deprive their consent of its natural efficacy, even though, had they known what they were consenting to, they would have withheld consent. The description of the modern attitude, quoted from *The Tablet*, fails to make this distinction between opinion and intention.² It speaks of people not having "the full Christian intention" when they marry, because they share the "public opinion" as to the dissolubility of marriage. We tried to show, in an earlier answer,³ how and why it is that a false notion about the dissolubility of

¹ Cf. Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, V (ed. 1950), n. 54.

² It should be added that the writer of the passage quoted does not accept the conclusion drawn from it by critics of the marriage laws.

³ THE CLERGY REVIEW, November 1954, p. 676.

the marriage bond is not necessarily translated into an intention to contract only a dissoluble bond. Rather than repeat what we then said, we think it better to quote from a Rotal sentence, *coram* Heard, in a Westminster case.¹

Many people, nowadays, entertain an erroneous opinion about the dissolubility of marriage, which they derive either from heretical doctrine, or pagan corruptions, or civil law. Now, simple error about the indissolubility of marriage, even if it give cause to the contract, does not vitiate matrimonial consent (can. 1084). When therefore, a marriage is alleged to be null owing to exclusion of indissolubility, the judge must carefully examine whether it is a case of mere error, or whether a party did exclude indissolubility by an act of will. Admittedly, one who thinks marriage to be dissoluble, intends in a sense a dissoluble contract, when he contracts marriage; but this is generally a *habitual* intention which neither enters the will, nor limits the consent by which one intends to enter into a true marriage as instituted by Christ; and indeed, the very fact that one thinks the consent to be already limited by law, makes it more difficult for him to limit it by a positive act of will. It must be presumed that the general intention of entering into Christian marriage prevails (Benedict XIV, *De Synodo*, XIII, c. 22). Under the old jurisprudence this presumption could not be rebutted, unless there was a pact between the parties to contract a dissoluble bond. Since the Code (can. 1086), this can no longer be said; it is certain that consent is sometimes limited by a simple resolution of the will ("propositum voluntatis").

If indeed there exists a law allowing divorce, and the contracting party does nothing more than to rely on the law, being content to be subject to it, he acts "ex mero errore" and his consent is not vitiated. But if he not merely relies on the law and submits himself to the permission of the law, but makes the law his own by a positive act of will, contracting with a true intention of benefiting by it, the general intention of entering into Christian marriage no longer prevails, and his consent is undoubtedly vitiated. Without a pact, it will not be easy to prove that he has really done so. Mere remarks made perhaps before the wedding about getting a divorce, if need be, do not suffice, since such remarks flow naturally from his erroneous concept of marriage, without proving any positive act of will. Still less help-

¹ *S.R.R. Decisiones*, 1942, dec. 17; vol. XXXIV, pp. 167-8.

ful are declarations made by a party after the breakdown of the marriage, that he would never have contracted marriage, if he had known it to be indissoluble; this merely shows that his error gave cause to the contract.

But if there were some grave reason owing to which the contracting party pondered in doubt whether to marry or not, it could easily be that he not only reflected that divorce was possible, or vaguely proposed to take that course, but proceeded to a positive intention of rejecting indissolubility, saying: "I shall break the bond, if it does not suit me"; and that this intention was not merely habitual or interpretative, but elicited by a positive act of will. If he manifested this intention to suitable witnesses "tempore non suspecto", there will be sufficient proof for a declaration of nullity.

It may be objected that this authoritative declaration of the mind of the Church presumes that "the general intention of entering Christian marriage prevails", whereas this is precisely the point of contention. The answer is that there is, by divine law, no other kind of marriage than that defined by Christ who, in addition to making the marriage of Christians a sacrament, reaffirmed the primitive indissolubility of marriage for all mankind. In other words, the Church presumes, until the contrary is proved, that those who have declared their will to marry intended to contract the only form of union which the divine law permits them, whether they know it or not.

NUMBER REQUIRED FOR BINATED MASS

Is one to gather from the answer on this subject, in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, August 1959, p. 494, that a priest may not use a faculty to binate, if less than "about twenty" people turn up for Mass, but must send them away without Mass? (W.)

REPLY

Canon 806, §2: "Hanc tamen facultatem (sc. binandi) impertiri nequit Ordinarius, nisi cum, prudenti ipsius iudicio, propter penuriam sacerdotum die festo de praecepto notabilis fidelium pars Missae adstare non possit. . . ."

The brief answer to the above case is that the priest need not send the congregation away without Mass when they are less than twenty in number.

In the earlier answer to which our correspondent refers, we explained that, according to the common teaching, based on one or two decisions of the Holy Office, the phrase "*notabilis fidelium pars*" must normally be taken to mean "about twenty" or "twenty to thirty" persons, but that a lesser number would suffice in special cases, the decision resting, in the final issue, with the local Ordinary. Whatever counting of heads may be required by the law, however, is to be done when the faculty is granted by the Ordinary, rather than when it is exercised by the priest. Canon 806, §2, forbids the Ordinary to impart the faculty, except when he prudently judges that a notable number of the faithful will otherwise be deprived of Mass; but there is no canon which directly forbids the recipient of the faculty to use it, if, on a particular occasion, the Ordinary's estimate of the need is not verified.

On the other hand, since the law requires the Ordinary to exercise prudence in this matter and not grant the faculty unnecessarily, he has a right to be informed, if his estimate of the need, based commonly on information supplied to him by the priest, is shown by experience to be very wide of the mark, not merely on the odd occasion, but habitually. He may have been fully justified initially in granting the faculty by what then seemed a prudent expectation that it would enable and encourage a notable number of people to come to Mass, who would otherwise miss Mass, culpably or inculpably. Normally some time must elapse before one can tell whether an expectation of this kind is likely or unlikely to be fulfilled. Meanwhile, the priest who has received the faculty may lawfully use it, even though the attendance regularly falls well short of the number anticipated and canonically required. But once it becomes clear that the requirements of the law are not being fulfilled and are unlikely to be fulfilled in the near future, the priest must submit the case once again to the judgement of the Ordinary and await his decision.¹

L. L. McR.

¹ Cf. A. Bride, in *L'Ami du clergé*, 8 May 1958, pp. 295-6.

OPENING OF A CHURCH

A church is to be opened on the third Sunday of Advent. What form should the opening take and what Mass should be celebrated? (B. M.)

REPLY

Before a church is used for divine service it must be dedicated to divine worship either by solemn consecration or at least by solemn blessing (*C. J. C.*, canon 1165, §1). The consecration of a church is an episcopal function whose rite is given in the *Pontificale Romanum*. A cathedral must be consecrated, and as far as possible a conventual church or a parish church should also be consecrated (*C. J. C.*, canon 1165, §3). If a church cannot, at least for the moment, be consecrated, it should be blessed by the solemn form of blessing for a new church given in the Roman Ritual, IX, ix, 17. To use this blessing needs the leave of the Ordinary.

When a church is solemnly blessed it is given a Title, i.e. some divine Person, Mystery, or Saint to whose honour the church is built—in the second place, every church is primarily dedicated to the Godhead—and after whom it is named. After the blessing Mass is to be celebrated in honour of the Titular. It ranks as a solemn votive Mass *pro re gravi*, and should be at least a sung Mass. Such a Mass is excluded on a double of the first class, and as all the Sundays of Advent enjoy this rank since the Simplification of the Rubrics (1955), the votive Mass is not permitted on the third Sunday of Advent. The Mass of the Sunday must be celebrated with a commemoration of the Titular under one conclusion with the prayers of the Sunday Mass.

THE THREE CHRISTMAS MASSES

What is the origin and significance of the three Christmas Masses? (Curious.)

REPLY

The special feature of our celebration of the Christmas festival by three Masses—in *nocte*, in *aurora*, in *die*—is Roman in origin, and finds its explanation not in ascetics or mysticism but in sober history. It dates from the fifth century.

The oldest of the three Masses in the Roman Missal is the third. It represents the normal station Mass which the Pope used to celebrate in St Peter's on the morning of Christmas Day after Terce of the Divine Office. This Mass was in honour of the mystery of the Incarnation to celebrate the divinity of Christ, defended so vigorously at that period following the heresy of Arius, and so the Gospel is the famous pericope from the beginning of St John's gospel. The Station for this—our third Mass—is given in the Missal as St Mary Major's; it was transferred thither from St Peter's, in the eleventh or twelfth century, for the greater convenience of the Pope when he resided in the Lateran Palace.

Early in the fifth century there was also at St Peter's, it seems, a Mass about dawn following the vigil office *ad gallicantum*, and its formulary was the same as that of our second Mass, except for the Gospel, which was the entire narrative of Christ's birth (Luke ii, 1-20). Later, when the Pope celebrated his second Mass at the *Titulus Anastasiae* (see below) this dawn Mass at St Peter's was celebrated by a priest, and later still was dropped altogether.

Our first Mass, at midnight, took its origin in the church of St Mary Major's in Rome after its restoration by Sixtus III (432-440), following the Council of Ephesus (431) which proclaimed the divine motherhood of our Lady. The Pope used to celebrate Mass in an oratory in the basilica, called *Praeseptium*,¹ which had been constructed in imitation of the grotto in the church of the Nativity at Bethlehem. This Mass, celebrated about midnight, was then the Pope's first Christmas Mass, and was really the termination of the vigil Office. This Mass was to honour specially the motherhood of the Blessed Virgin, and its

¹ Only much later were the relics of the Crib brought to Rome and placed there (mid-seventh century).

texts were chosen for that purpose. The formulary for this Mass was changed at a later date. Some authorities, however, think that the midnight Mass was introduced in imitation of one celebrated from the fourth century in the grotto of the church of the Nativity at Bethlehem.

Having celebrated his first Mass at St Mary's Major's the Pope from the seventh century went to the *Titulus Anastasiae* for his second Mass. There was a church at the foot of the Palatine called *Titulus Anastasiae*, founded possibly by a lady of that name, and this church became in the sixth century, at the period of Byzantine rule in Rome, the court church for the Byzantine officials; but they venerated there a saint of the name of Anastasia, a fourth-century martyr of Sirmium, greatly venerated by the Byzantines (her relics had been brought to Constantinople), whose feast was on 25 December. To honour the imperial court Pope John III (561-74) went to this *Titulus* to celebrate the *natale* of St Anastasia. At first the Mass there in the early hours of Christmas Day was the Mass of St Anastasia¹ with only a commemoration of the Nativity, but after the ending of the Byzantine hegemony the position was reversed—St Anastasia was commemorated only—and a new formulary for the second Christmas Mass was introduced.

For centuries only the Pope celebrated Mass three times on Christmas Day, it was his special privilege, but because the formularies for the three Masses were in the liturgical books, in the course of time the three Masses were celebrated by priests also. At first each Mass had a separate celebrant, but eventually—the first record of this is in the twelfth century—priests took to celebrating all three Masses. This was regarded as a sign of special joy and festivity for so great a feast.

Naturally during the Middle Ages symbolical or mystical reasons were thought out to account for the three Masses, and some of the texts of the three formularies ingeniously invoked to support them: (1) the three Masses represented the eternal birth of the Word from the Father in the glory of the Godhead; His birth in time of the Virgin Mary in the humility of the flesh; His spiritual rebirth in the hearts of the faithful by faith and

¹ And so the second Christmas Mass in the Gregorian Sacramentary gives her prayers before the commemoration of the Nativity.

charity; (2) the midnight Mass commemorates the eternal birth of the Word: *Filius meus es tu ego hodie genui te* (Introit); in the dawn Mass Jesus is regarded as the light of the world: *Lux fulgebit hodie super nos* (Introit); the third Mass honours His historical birth in Bethlehem: *Puer natus est nobis*.

BELL-RINGING AT MASS

Should the bell be rung at the Sanctus and *Domine, non sum dignus* at a dialogue Mass? (X. Y.)

REPLY

Before the twelfth or thirteenth century no bell was rung in the church during Mass. Towards the end of the twelfth century, as a result of a theological controversy, the Elevation of the Sacred Host was introduced. This led to the desire of the people to look on the Host and this act became invested in the popular mind with a quasi-sacramental efficacy, which later developed into a superstition, and eventually the practice declined, to be revived in the present century—in 1907 by St Pius X who endowed it with a rich indulgence—shorn of its superstition. A bell was, therefore, introduced to warn people of the approaching Elevation, not only those present at Mass—for whom the warning bell shortly before the Consecration later came into use—but also those outside the church who used then to rush in, or to one of the low windows, to see the Host.

For this purpose, in addition to the bells of the church, a special bell, called in England the "sance bell", was used—a bell situated usually on the eastern gable of the nave in a bell-cote or hung on the wall of the church at the Epistle side, having, in both cases, a bell-pull that was within reach of the server. At a later period the small portable bell, called the "sanctus bell", came into use, and was sometimes rung by the server to warn outsiders by putting his hand through a low window often found in mediæval churches for this very purpose.

The bell at the Sanctus had also another meaning, it expressed jubilation and joy, united with the angelic choirs, as it

was rung (from the twelfth century) at the *Gloria in excelsis* in the Easter Mass, and is now then rung both on Maundy Thursday and at the Easter vigil Mass, with the church bells. The use of the bell at the Sanctus and Elevation¹ was fairly general in the sixteenth century, yet it is not mentioned in Burchard's *Ordo Missae* (1502)—from which the *Ritus celebrandi* is derived—nor in St Pius V's edition of the Roman Missal (1570), nor in the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*² (1600). It is, however, in the rubrics of Clement VIII's edition of the Missal in 1604.

The present rubrics mention *parva campanula* (*Rubricae Generales*, xx) among the requisites for Mass; the *Ritus*, VII, 8, mentions at the Sanctus *ministro parvam campanulam pulsante*; at the Elevation, *Ritus VIII*, 6, says of the server *manu dextera pulsat campanulam ter ad unamquamque elevationem vel continue*. These rubrics occur in the rite of low Mass, and while they were also applied to high Mass in many places, this was not done in Rome. Accordingly, in connexion with the Eucharistic Congress held in Rome in 1922, a query was submitted to *S.R.C.* by a number of bishops and others: are these rubrics of the *Ritus* to be applied to high, sung, and pontifical Masses about which the rubrics of the Missal and the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (II, viii) are silent? *S.R.C.* replied that in view of the common and ancient practice of ringing the bell at the places in Mass mentioned in the rubrics, and in view of the reasons for bell-ringing, i.e. "the attention, joy, devotion, profession of faith in the true and real presence of Jesus Christ in the Most Holy Eucharist of the faithful and their union with the angelic choirs in praising and adoring God", the bell ought to be rung in high Masses also. And *S.R.C.* added: "In addition, to eliminate as far as possible the incongruity of some in church, whether at a distance or nearby, being present at the chief parts of the sacred mysteries without attention or reverence, it is highly desirable (*maxime expedit*) that shortly before the Consecration the bell should be rung in accordance with common usage."³

Accordingly, even at a dialogue Mass, when the ringing of the bell is not needed as a signal, it should still be done, not

¹ Introduced also in the thirteenth century.

² There is a passing reference to a bell in I, xxix, 6, at the private Mass of a bishop.

³ *S.R.C.*, 25 October 1922 (n. 4377).

necessarily in a noisy manner, as an expression of joy, until such time as the present rubric is altered, if ever.

As for the bell at *Domine non sum dignus*, this is not prescribed by any rubric, and is merely a common usage. Its only purpose here can be as a signal to intending communicants that the moment to approach the altar is at hand. As the ringing has no connexion with the triple prayer, and unnecessary ringing is undesirable, it is better to ring once only at this part of Mass.

"GLORIA PATRI" AT END OF PSALMS

What is the history and meaning of *Gloria Patri* at the end of psalms? (N. N.)

REPLY

The little doxology (or prayer of praise), as the *Gloria Patri* is called in contrast to the "Great doxology", *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, is simply a development of the Trinitarian formula of baptism. The author of its present form—derived from a number of biblical expressions—and the exact date at which it was introduced into the Liturgy are not at present known.

In the Roman rite *Gloria Patri* is used in Mass at the close of psalm 42 (*Judica*), in the Introit (usually some verses of a psalm) and at the end of the part of psalm 25 used at the Lavabo, except in Passiontide and in Requiem Masses. It is used to terminate psalms in the Divine Office (except during the Triduum Sacrum and in the Office for the dead), and the first part is used in responsories (except during Passiontide and in the Office for the dead).

Concluding the recitation of psalms by some form of doxology was a Jewish practice. Each of the first four books of the Psalms, according to what was probably the primitive division, concludes with an outburst of praise (e.g. psalms 40¹⁴, 105⁴⁸). Expressions of praise, similar to the *Gloria Patri*, are found scattered throughout the Pauline Epistles (e.g. Ephesians 3²¹) and in the Apocalypse (e.g. 7¹²). The short doxology was used, too, in various forms, by the early Fathers. The first part

of the present form of the prayer became the established one, as a profession of faith, in the fourth century during the struggles against Arianism (denying the divinity of the Second Person) and Macedonianism (denying the divinity of the Third Person). Later in the Western Church (except in Spain) came the addition "sicut erat", etc., affirming the co-eternity of the three Divine Persons.

The Roman rite owes two elements to the Syrian rite of the fourth century which introduced the antiphonal way of singing psalms and the *Gloria Patri* at their conclusion, both designed to enable the people—who did not know entire psalms, but could repeat one verse and could add the little doxology—to take an active part in the Liturgy. This use of *Gloria Patri* found its way into Gaul by the fifth century; and was in use in Rome in the fourth, possibly introduced by Pope Damasus (366–84). It was widespread in Christendom before the sixth century.

In the present Roman rite special marks of reverence for the Most Holy Trinity accompany the recitation of the *Gloria Patri*: the bowing of the head, the uncovering of the head if the biretta is being worn, the cessation of movement during it (e.g. during the Asperges, or at the incensation of those in choir).

J. B. O'C.

BOOK REVIEWS

Théologie de l'Église. By Charles Journet. Pp. 444. (Textes et Études Théologiques. Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges, 1958. 195 Belgium francs.)

MANY a busy priest on a visit to a bookshop must have caught sight of a very large book on the Church and wistfully turned its pages. The book in question is the first volume of Mgr Journet's extensive treatise on the Church, *The Church of the Word Incarnate*, published in an English translation a few years ago and reviewed here (October 1955, pp. 594–7). A priest seeing it is likely to be wistful because a man busy in the pastoral ministry does not as a rule feel able to embark on the study of work of nearly six hundred large pages, especially when it is presented as merely the first volume of a four-volume treatise. He would be even more discouraged in this instance if he knew that the next volume—still only available in French—is

twice the size of the first. Here is a work, by all accounts one of the most significant works of our time on the Church, full of untold theological riches on what is a key doctrine at the present day, inaccessible by the sheer length and scale of the treatment. Many must have said, Why doesn't someone give us a digest of its contents, so that they can be assimilated by the ordinary run of the clergy and by the laity too? It is a joy then to announce that the author himself has prepared an abridgement of the first two volumes of his treatise and in doing so has offered a wide public a truly splendid book on the Church.

But how can this abridgement of the first two volumes of a four-volume treatise be complete as a presentation of the Church? The fact is that Mgr Journet had to anticipate in his second volume many of the themes destined for more detailed consideration in the projected third volume; it has been possible then by rearrangement to give them their proper relief in this smaller work. The fourth volume is to deal with the Church in the days of its preparation before Christ and in its consummation in purgatory and heaven. This matter can be omitted in a book on the Church as at present amongst us, without detriment to its unity.

If anyone still doubts whether *Théologie de l'Église* stands on its own feet, let him glance at the table of contents. After a first presentation of the Church, its aspects and states, there is a chapter on Christ as Head of the Church, followed by one on the Holy Spirit in the Church and another on Mary and the Church. Then comes the chapter on the hierarchy and the note of apostolicity, and the author passes on to consider in turn the created soul of the Church, the holiness of the Church, its body and its membership. This leads to the chapter on the mystery and the miracle of its Catholic unity and to the final one on the definitions of the Church. The book concludes with a commentary on Christ's prayer for unity, reproduced without change from the larger treatise. Few books on the Church offer so balanced a treatment of their subject-matter.

In making the abridgement the author has simply transcribed many passages, but others have been summarized with the omission of many technicalities, and further the arrangement of the material has been quite noticeably changed. The changes and omissions have transformed the larger work and given this volume quite a different character and appeal. It has an attractive brevity and directness. The essential riches of the larger work are still there, but now they are set forth in a form that makes them readily available to many. To describe the book as a popular work would be an exaggeration; it remains a piece of serious theology. Parts of it are indeed imme-

diately accessible to ordinary readers, but much still requires careful reflective reading.

While praise and gratitude are rightly dominant in the response to this book, the same reservations as before must be made concerning Mgr Journet's theological method. His power of synthesis is remarkable but his thought is too tidy. To judge simply from his writing, one might get the impression that the theology of the Church had reached the state of highest perfection, all difficulties resolved and no aspect left uncovered. Some very real problems seem to vanish from sight by a too facile use of convenient distinctions. Despite the impression imparted by some of his commentators, St Thomas has not this kind of tidiness. Even in the *Summa Theologiae* there are many loose ends—remarks and suggestions that do not fit in very easily with the rest of the treatment. St Thomas had too vivid a sense of the complex richness of the revealed realities he was studying to wish to tie them up too neatly in the categories and divisions of human thought. Mgr Journet has the deepest sense of the transcendence of his subject; his thought, however, is too orderly and insufficiently flexible, with too ready a tendency to freeze the overflowing data into excessively rigid schemes. In line with that, his use of the Bible lacks that freshness and that feel for the living thought of the sacred writers which characterize the more recent writing on Biblical theology. Mgr Journet deepens immensely our understanding of the mystery of the Church; he also fills us with admiration for his assured grasp of its theology; but he does not bring home to us that there is much hard thinking still to be done on a great many points. That is a defect, because, in fact, there is.

Les tendances nouvelles de l'ecclésiologie. By Stanislas Jákí, O.S.B. Pp. 274. (Bibliotheca Academicae Catholicae Hungaricae. Casa Editrice Herder, Rome. Lire 3800.)

THIS is a detailed survey of theological writing on the Church from Moehler to the present day. It is not, however, a mere report on recent writing; the work is intended as an analytic and critical study of the new look in ecclesiology. The author points out, as Fr Congar has also done, that the new tendencies imply a striving for an extension of theological method, one that can take account of the concrete and the subjective as well as the abstract and the objective. The Church must be studied not merely in its unchanging essence but in its historical presence and activity, in its development and multiple influence on men. The purpose of the author is to reflect on this theological approach, to record its achievements and to criticize its defects. His general verdict is decidedly favourable.

When did the renewal in ecclesiology begin? Dom Stanislas traces it back to Romanticism with its stress on life and vital values. It is in the setting of this movement that we find in the theologians of Tübingen, above all in Moehler, the beginnings of modern theology on the Church. The other great forerunner in this matter is Newman. Here, as so often, Newman was ahead of his time; all the themes of modern ecclesiology can be found in his writings. So far, most readers will be on familiar ground. They will probably be unacquainted with the next pioneer thinker whose work is examined, the lay theologian, Pilgram. Admittedly little read, he did influence a number of German ecclesiologists and his writing brought the theology of the Church into relation with other branches of human thought. Besides the work of these three writers and their disciples, other factors have been important. There was the struggle with naturalism, which led Catholics to an awareness of the mystery of the Church. More significant still has been the renewal of interior life within the Church. This spiritual renewal, manifested in the liturgical movement, in the return to a more Christocentric piety, in a realization of the dignity of the laity, in the Christian social movement, made the mystery of the Church the object of a living experience that anticipated and stimulated theological reflexion. The author concludes his chapter on the origins by noting certain deviations and their correction.

The next chapter is devoted to recent non-Catholic ecclesiology. The trends in Protestant and Orthodox writing and the Catholic reaction to them are discussed. Two sections are then given to the ecclesiology of the ecumenical movement and the repercussions it has had on Catholic theology. What has been made evident to Catholics is the need to pay greater attention to the inner aspect of the Church and thus show the richness of the Catholic conception of the Church to those who think that we pay exclusive attention to the juridical side. It has compelled, too, an enlargement of theological method, since the theologians who wish to contribute to the discussion must take into account vital and human factors that have been neglected in the past. English readers will lament the lack of any adequate account of Anglican ecclesiology.

The third chapter of the book then considers the return to the sources that has taken place. It outlines what has been done to study Biblical, patristic and Scholastic thought on the Church. Despite the great progress that has been made there is a certain one-sidedness, particularly in the Biblical field. A great deal of work has been done to clarify the Biblical teaching on the inner or mystical aspect of the Church, but not much as yet to penetrate the idea of the hierarchy

or of the theandric mediation of the Church. In coming to Scholastic thought, the author has to deal with the problem caused by the wide use by the mediaevals of the term "mystical Body", a use that contrasts with the rigorous identification with the visible Church made by Pius XII. For the Scholastic writers the notion of the mystical Body was concerned more with the life of the Church than with its structure, and hence they gave it a meaning that included within it all the just from Adam onwards and even the angels. This led Mitterer to speak of a conflict between St Thomas and Pius XII and to argue that the Pope had corrected the Angelic Doctor in his encyclical. Unlike Zapelena, Dom Stanislas favours a wider as well as a narrower use of the term "mystical Body", and he maintains that the Scholastics were simply echoing faithfully the patristic tradition. The encyclical itself, he urges, suggests a wider meaning of the term when it considers how men may belong to the Church.

The last chapter is concerned with speculative and doctrinal studies. The two aspects of the Church, its visible structure and its inner life, must be brought together and kept together. The author expresses the regret that the new movement in ecclesiology should sometimes be thought of as in opposition to the traditional post-Tridentine theology rather than as completing and perfecting it. There is a danger of passing from one excess to another. What should be borne in mind and studied is the sacramental structure of the Church, which unites in full harmony both the visible and invisible aspects. The chapter goes on to deal with the universal mediation of the Church. It is more helpful to stress the universal mediation, realized in different ways, of the visible Catholic Church than to try to mark out the precise limits of that Church. The two final sections discuss the definition of the Church and the bearing of ecclesiology on theology. In his conclusion the author insists on the distinction between the apologetic and dogmatic handling of the Church. There is need for a complete dogmatic treatment, one that will include all those points examined, but in a different way, in apologetics. Only in that way will the full significance of all the aspects of the Church be recognized and the dogmatic treatise on the Church be properly balanced.

C. D.

Le Culte des Souverains dans la Civilisation Gréco-Romaine. By L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriaux. Pp. 535. (Desclée, Paris, 1957.)

THE distinguished authors of this exhaustively documented work—the 5th volume in the 3rd series of *Bibliothèque de Théologie*—have rendered a very great service to the study of ruler cult in the Greek

and Roman world. To write a thoroughgoing history of ancient ruler cult is—as Fritz Taeger points out in the foreword to his *Charisma, Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*, Vol. I (Stuttgart, 1957)—quite impossible at the present time. It can only be studied in its numerous partial manifestations, such as they have come down to us in various guises. The merit of this present work is precisely this, that it presents the student with the whole body of this evidence in convenient form, together with the authors' valuable summary and conclusions, and a bibliography which is almost bewildering in its comprehensiveness.

The Hellenistic kingdoms inherited and perpetuated the customs of the oriental monarchies and hence the authors rightly devote a preliminary chapter to the East, incidentally contrasting the religious views of the Hebrews with those of the Pharaohs and the Mesopotamian, Persian and Hittite kingdoms. They then consider the evidence in Crete, in Homeric and classical Greece, in the Macedonian era, the Hellenistic period, and finally in Rome and the Roman Empire. A final chapter evaluates the significant aspects of ruler worship and its main trends, and concludes with a valuable section contrasting the ideas of classical Greece and Rome with those of Judaism and Christianity.

Much of the evidence for ruler cult in Greece in the pre-Macedonian era can safely be ascribed to national hero-worship and to the literary conventions of the time. Only rarely do we come across a case of the divinization of a living person. Indeed, the idea was repugnant to the Greek mind, as evidence of *hybris*. Even so, the Greek legends certainly fostered the notion that men by their own merits were susceptible of becoming gods. Various philosophical notions, particularly that of *metempsychosis*, gave encouragement to the view. In practice, however, the political systems of Sparta and Athens precluded the possibility of any single leader claiming for himself divine honours. Religious prestige was accorded to law (*nomos*) rather than individuals, who could be ostracized (from Athens) if their power threatened to become dangerous. It was no individual but the *polis*, as a collective equality, that *syn tois theois* claimed the glory of having conquered the Persians and risen to greatness.

With the advent of the Greek and Macedonian kingship the problem becomes more difficult, the precise significance of the evidence more difficult to assess. There can be no doubt that—to quote Professor Adcock's happy aphorism—ruler cult “was not the root of Hellenistic monarchy; it was rather the leaves on its branches” (*Greek and Macedonian Kingship*, Raleigh Lecture, British Academy,

1953); but even so it is no easy matter to assess how much weight must be given, respectively, to oriental influence, poetic and artistic conventions, the megalomania of kings and their acceptance of court flattery, their calculated political policy, and the extent and purpose of the posthumous honours accorded to them. The evidence amassed in this book will be of invaluable assistance to the student to make up his mind on these points. Canon Cerfaux's conclusions are stated in very cautious terms:

'On est tenté de conclure que s'il y a tendance à admettre que les souverains sont issus des dieux et que ces dieux se manifestent par eux, et même s'ils sont incorporés au rang divin après leur mort, cela ne préjuge pas, en général, de leur essence même: ils jouent le rôle de dieux sans doute, mais ils ne sont pas pour cela de nature pleinement divine' (p. 267).

In assessing the evidence relating to ruler cult in Rome up to the death of Augustus, our authors rightly stress two factors: the traditional Roman cult of the *genius* (both of Rome itself and of the individual), and the essentially sober, juridical character of Roman religion. Even when Roman poets seem to be more than ordinarily "oriental" in their adulation of Augustus, they rarely exceed the bounds of Roman restraint (cf. Eduard Fraenkel, *Horace*, Oxford, 1957, p. 249). When a Gallavotti writes: "Ottaviano è già dio; è stato Mercurio stesso ad assumere il suo aspetto sulla terra" (*Parola del Passato*, xii, p. 222), it is difficult to acquit him of gross exaggeration. Throughout the entire imperial period it is important to distinguish, as our authors do, between the cult which the Roman emperors permitted and even encouraged in the provinces, and that which was officially sanctioned in Rome.

Cerfaux and Tondriaux have together produced an outstanding textbook of invaluable assistance to the student of this fascinating subject. It is a work which can scarcely be commended too highly.

H. E. W.

A Practical Formulary in Accordance with the Code of Canon Law. By Rev. S. Pietrzyk. Second Revised Edition. Pp. xiii + 278. (Officium Libri Catholici—Catholic Book Agency, Rome. Price not stated.)

THE subtitle of this work, the author of which is an advocate and procurator of the Sacred Roman Rota and of the Signatura Apostolica, describes it as "necessary for parochial work, in the diocesan curia, in processes and in religious communities". Too much use of

it would be more apt to hinder than help parochial work, but curial officials should find it a helpful work of reference. In view, however, of the ever-increasing weight of paper with which ecclesiastical administration is burdened, it is to be hoped that even they will use it with discretion and not hesitate to cut out some of the verbiage with which, no doubt from the praiseworthy motive of providing for all eventualities, many of the forms given here are decked.

They are grouped under seven headings, according as they relate to profession of faith and oaths, diocesan administration, parochial business, religious orders and congregations, the sacraments, judicial and administrative processes, or the imposition and absolution of penalties. Explanatory notes introduce each form and normally a Latin as well as an English version is provided. The text is broken at intervals by a series of photographic plates of great works of art which, if their relevance is not always evident, would serve at least to relieve the monotony, were anyone so gluttonous for bureaucratic fodder as to attempt to read consecutively through the several hundred forms here contained.

Secular Institutes and the State of Perfection. The Priesthood and the State of Perfection. By Salvador Canals. Pp. 173. (Scepter, Dublin. 12s. 6d.)

ANYONE desirous of authoritative information about Secular Institutes can confidently seek it in this little book, which has been translated from the Spanish original. Not only is the author an eminent canonist, an official of the Rota, and a member of *Opus Dei*, the first such Institute to receive pontifical recognition, but he is in charge of the Office of Secular Institutes at the Sacred Congregation of Religious. As the title of the book indicates, there are here two treatises under the one cover, the first composed in 1947, shortly after the promulgation of the Apostolic Constitution which gave Secular Institutes a place in the legislative system of the Church, the other in 1952, after Pius XII had settled the controversy about the relation of the priesthood to the state of perfection. By way of appendix, an English version of the three principal documents is provided, the Constitution *Provida Mater Ecclesia*, the Motu Proprio *Primo Feliciter*, and the Instruction *Cum Sanctissimus*.

The first treatise, after a somewhat arid and technical analysis of states of life, well packed with latinisms, distinguishes between the life of perfection and the state of perfection and traces the historical evolution of the latter. It then describes the origin and development of Secular Institutes, the canonical difficulty of fitting

them into the traditional framework, and the solution which was eventually found in *Provida Mater Ecclesia*, which it studies in detail. The second treatise is mainly designed to show how a sacerdotal Secular Institute, such as *Opus Dei*, provides secular priests for the first time with a form of association through which they can practise the evangelical counsels in a canonically recognized state of perfection, without ceasing to be secular priests in fact and appearance, and without any weakening of the link which binds them to their bishop and diocese. It travels over some of the same ground as the first treatise, but from this different point of view, and opens up prospects of interest to the secular clergy in general, which, prior to 1947, could not have been contemplated.

At one point in this translated version, the evangelical counsels are described as "poverty, charity and obedience" (p. 27), canon 111 is twice cited in Roman numerals as "canon III" (pp. 99, 100), "ne" appears three times for "ni" in a quotation from a French work (p. 120); and is there really an association called "the Cathecist Ladies" (p. 53)?

L. L. McR.

A Florentine Portrait. By D. B. Wyndham Lewis. (Sheed & Ward. 12s. 6d.)

ST PHILIP BENIZI (1233-85) was first a doctor, then a lay-brother in the newly founded Servite Order, then, under obedience, a priest, then master of novices, then assistant to the General, and finally, at the age of thirty-four, General of the Order in which position he remained till his death. He is best remembered by the story of his flight from the Papacy, when he hid himself in the mountain lest the assembled Cardinals should place him on the chair of Peter, an act of humility which is symbolized by the tiara always placed at his feet in pictures and statues.

From the first he outshone every other personality in the history of the Servite Order, even the seven saints who were the Founders, to whom all Servites give the name of father—"our holy father St Philip".

Mr Wyndham Lewis makes him live again. He has gone to the best sources, and his vivid, moving narrative carries the reader along with a sense of expectancy and drama which he somehow maintains in the midst of many delightful digressions filling in the thirteenth-century background, deftly and unforgettably. He has wisely avoided the analytical psychological method which can so easily be made to carry conviction to modern readers—precisely because modern readers are such easy prey to anything which looks like a

scholarly interpretation. In any case there was no material for that. St Philip left no personal writings (at least little or nothing survived) and his recorded sayings are mostly in a conventional idiom. The story is made to speak for itself and the interpretation of character is largely Mr Wyndham Lewis's interpretation of events. It was a good method—in fact the only possible method—and the measure of its success is seen in the undeniable fact that anyone acquainted with the historical sources will immediately recognize the saint in this charming and convincing portrait, will, in fact, see hitherto hidden features which undoubtedly belong to this most glorious of the Servite Saints.

F. MILDNER, O.S.M.

Reading for Catholic Parents. By F. J. Sheed. Pp. 40. (Sheed & Ward. Paper 2s.)

HAVING enjoyed Mr Sheed's *Are We Really Teaching Religion?* and his various other books including his latest one *Theology for Beginners*, we all know what to expect from him.

I am very glad to find him laying out some reading for Catholic parents because it is all too easy, as he points out in his Introduction, for us to shelve the responsibility for the teaching of children on to schools. There is absolutely no substitute for the home, and no substitute for the parental background, and no substitute for religion learnt at the mother's knee.

But as Mr Sheed points out so clearly in his few chapters, it is not a matter of a blind faith received from parents who are themselves unable to explain it. In this world today, where so many children are getting what is supposedly a higher form of education, it is very important for parents to keep pace with what their children are doing. The authority of the parent depends to a large extent upon his or her ability to remain ahead of the child in various subjects. This obviously is not the only importance and authority in a parent, but in general education it is useful and helpful, Mr Sheed asserts, for the parents to be interested in what their children are doing, and to be able to help them to some extent even in their school work.

It is however much more essential that they should be able to help their children in their religious development. Over and over again in talking to parents and in preaching I find I am repeating the sadness of the number who lapse because they seem to have little or no support from their parents. It is impossible to send a child to a Catholic school and expect that child to grow up in the Catholic Faith, if the parents are slack in their own Faith. Just

because the Faith is something which has to be lived, it is something which has to be understood. If the parents do not continue to make progress in studying their religion, it is extremely difficult to encourage their own children to do so.

Mr Sheed's book is very simple and should be put into the hands of every parent. I suggest particularly that schools who run Parents' Associations, as so many now do, should produce this when they have a Parents' Day, either giving it to the parent directly or suggesting that parents should read it.

The only criticism which I would have of it, which I hesitate to make, is that the range of books covered by Mr Sheed does not seem to include one single book specifically on prayer. I know he has one or two on the Rosary and something on The Mass, but it would seem to me almost essential that parents should be able to know something about prayer in general in order to explain it a little to their children. Knowledge by itself is clearly not all that matters: it is the knowledge backed up by the love of God, through living a full life of prayer, study and relaxation—in fact the Catholic way of life.

The Way of the Cross. By Mgr Romano Guardini. Woodcuts by Michael Biggs. Pp. 77. (Scepter Limited. 9s. 6d.)

I AM always partial to Romano Guardini and the things that he writes. He has without any doubt enlightened a great many people in the course of his life, by his preaching, teaching, and writing.

We're now given a slim little book on the Stations of the Cross. Personally I find that the Stations of the Cross tend either to have to be the old form, which I have known all my life, and therefore would seem very natural and "ring a bell" each time that I go through them; or else it has to be my own private devotion in which I think, or speak, along the lines of my own particular thoughts and feelings at that particular time.

Therefore in reading through this little booklet by Romano Guardini, I saw the value of it, and enjoyed the illustrations. But at the same time I would only advocate it for those who feel that they need a new approach, or some more assimilation to their own thoughts. This is largely a private devotion, though sometimes it is done in public. If this will, as I am sure that it will, help me to a deeper understanding of Christ's sufferings, then I have only praise for it. It might be useful for priests to give them new ideas and new ways of putting across the ancient devotion, which is so well used during Lent; but which has a great danger of dying out, now that we have so many evening Masses, and even the Good Friday Liturgy,

which makes it less likely that people will know the Stations of the Cross as well as they used to do.

The woodcuts are plain, and worth study. They form a good illustration to the text.

It should be said that this is a venture by a new firm of publishers in Dublin, and their effort needs encouragement. The actual production of the book, the printing, the woodcuts, are all of quite a high standard.

La tres simple histoire du Curé d'Ars. By R. Gilbert. Pp. 96. (Vitte. Price not given.)

The Curé d'Ars: A Pictorial Biography. Text by the Right Rev. Rene Fourrey, Bishop of Belley. Pp. 85. Pictures by Rene Perrin. 115 plates. (Burns & Oates. 35s.)

THE centenary year of the Curé d'Ars has brought forth the usual crop of stories, biographies, etc.

Of the ones which I have read, I think the most charming is the first one mentioned here. Quite simply, as he says, the author takes the various points in the life of the Curé and deals with them in four paragraphs almost, which tell vividly, and succinctly, the whole of the essence of the life of the Curé d'Ars.

I think if anyone wanted a small book containing the real Curé, he could not do better than to purchase this. The French is simple, as is the whole sentiment of the work, and therefore it expresses very well the spirit of the Curé.

A more pretentious book, and a more costly one, is the *Pictorial Biography*. There have been a considerable number of pictorial biographies of the various saints in the past years, most of them produced under another format than the one spoken of here. Frankly the others were produced on a better scale than this one, and I feel that even the photographs were better. I am thinking in particular of the Lives of St Ignatius, St Bernadette, St Francis of Assisi and so on. Somehow this new one does not quite compare with them—though naturally there is less, in fact, to photograph in the life of the Curé d'Ars than in any of the other saints mentioned.

However, the comparative lack of pictorial satisfaction in this book is made up for by the straightforward text which comprises half the work. The chapter headings are much the same as in any life of the Curé, but there are included excerpts from documents which have never before been published. There are plenty of friendly, homely anecdotes; but the story as a whole is set forth quite straightforwardly, without a lot of flowery extravagance. The great characteristic which has drawn out the whole is the sense of

humour of the Curé; he could laugh not only at others, but also at himself.

There are frequent quotations from his sermons. I always feel with them that one is surprised that they were so ordinary, so down to earth, so colloquial. Yet this is true of the whole man. He was simple and holy; therefore his words, ordinary words, took on a new meaning, which only a saint could give them; but which no sinner could, however great his eloquence. This is the charm of the Curé, that he was not a preacher in the sense of a Bossuet; in fact at the end of his life he was inaudible; but he still retained his magnetic power, because he was holy.

The illustrations are interleaved with sayings of the Curé, in large print, which suddenly seems out of place; and gives the impression that the book is really for children, and I am sure that this is not the intention.

M. H.

Objets et Habits Liturgiques. By Robert Lesage. Pp. 127. (Librairie Arthème Fayard, Paris. 1958).

CANON LESAGE is Master of Ceremonies of the diocese of Paris. He has written a very large number of booklets on various ceremonies—with which he should be intimately acquainted—and one book *Dictionnaire Pratique de Liturgie Romaine* (1952).

The small book under review contains quite a good description, in brief terms, and with some interesting historical notes, of the altar, the chief material objects used in the Liturgy, the dress and insignia of clerics of all ranks up to and including the pope, sacred vestments and linens. As a synopsis it is a useful book. The bibliography appended by Canon Lesage is very limited and makes no mention of books other than French ones.

In a second edition there are a few minor errors to be corrected, e.g. the permission of the local Ordinary is normally needed to introduce the practice of celebrating Mass facing the people (p. 13), because of contrary custom with the force of law; seven candles are used by the Ordinary in his diocese only for a pontifical Mass of the living.

J. B. O'C.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

Printed in England by THE ANCHOR PRESS LTD., Tiptree, Essex, and published for the proprietors by THE TABLET PUBLISHING CO., LTD., 128 Sloane Street, S.W.1, in the County of London.

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLV NO. 2 FEBRUARY 1960

ENGLISH SPIRITUAL WRITERS

XIV. WILLIAM BASIL MATURIN 1847-1915

IT WAS almost impossible to realize that Fr Maturin was a convert—and I think this was partly because he was so very Irish. He was not only unusual in being a convert from the Church of Ireland, he was almost unique in having belonged in it to a High Church clerical family. His father was Vicar of Grangegorman, Dublin, and the family of ten children were brought up at home, going only to a day school and having few friends from the world outside.

This isolation is, I think, a second reason for the sense one had that Basil Maturin had been a Catholic all his life. Speaking of the High Church group to which he had always belonged he said later:

What they live in is not given them by the English Church. . . . When I analysed the Church of my dreams and of my allegiance as an Anglican, I found it living at my side in the form of Rome. In coming to Rome I felt that I simply transferred myself to where I belonged. I believe practically what I have always believed, with the addition of the divine authority of the Papacy.

From a home where Catholic doctrine was taught and lived by, after a brief interlude at Woolwich, Basil Maturin went as first a deacon then an ordained curate to an old friend of his father's at Peterstow in Herefordshire. Thence he passed to the Cowley Fathers with whom he spent the rest of his Anglican life. Thus in Ireland, England and for ten years in America he was living in the midst of men of "intense goodness and holiness . . . who believe most of the Catholic Faith". He had never been a Protestant and although one could perhaps find omissions in some of his earlier books it would usually be impossible to discover from the positive content which were written before and which after his reception. His theology of the Church is the